



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

C 8348.165.20

Harvard College Library



**BOUGHT FROM THE
ANDREW PRESTON PEABODY
FUND**



**BEQUEATHED BY
CAROLINE EUSTIS PEABODY
OF CAMBRIDGE**

•

•

—

—

~~62348.165.20~~

62348.165.20 (2)

Harvard College Library



**BOUGHT FROM THE
ANDREW PRESTON PEABODY
FUND**

**BEQUESTED BY
CAROLINE EUSTIS PEABODY
OF CAMBRIDGE**

MEMOIRS
OF
JOSEPH STURGE.

BY
HENRY RICHARD.



ELBERTON, THE BIRTHPLACE OF JOSEPH STURGE.

"2"
SECOND THOUSAND.

LONDON:
S. W. PARTRIDGE, 9, PATERNOSTER ROW.
A. W. BENNETT, 5, BISHOPSGATE WITHIN.
1865.

C 8348.165.2.0 (5)



CHAPTER XII.

SUNDAY TRAVELLING. RIOTS IN BIRMINGHAM.

Mr. Sturge becomes a Director of the London and Birmingham Railway—The Question of Sunday Travelling—Friends' View of the Sabbath—His Reasons for objecting to running Trains on that Day—Injustice to the Company's Servants—Injurious Moral Effect—Submits a Motion to the Board—Then appeals to the Proprietors—His Speech on that Occasion—Is defeated and retires from the Direction—Is chosen an Alderman of Birmingham—Refuses to subscribe the Declaration—Disturbed State of the Town—The Meeting at the Bull Ring—'The National Convention'—The London Police brought down—Collision with the People—Angry Excitement—'The National Holiday'—Riot—Mr. Sturge saves some of the Rioters from Execution—Moves a Committee to enquire into the Causes of the Riot—Its Report—Peculiar Civic Government of Birmingham at the Time—Government Measure of Police—Its despotic Provisions—Mr. Sturge opposes it—Exciting public Meeting—His Influence in calming the People—His Speech on that Occasion—Is severely censured—His Defence of his own Conduct—Extracts from his Letters.

In order not to interrupt the narrative of Mr. Sturge's labours in the anti-slavery cause, we have omitted to refer, at the precise time of their occurrence, to his activities in connection with some other matters to which we must now return.

The reader will probably remember, that in the touching memorandum, previously cited, which Mr. Sturge wrote, as it were, over the grave of his deceased wife, one of the duties which he conceived to devolve upon him, as he returned from the seclusion of his sorrows to the practical activities of life, was the prevention, so far as that lay in his power, of Sunday travel-

ling on the London and Birmingham Railway. We have now briefly to explain the views he entertained on that subject, and the steps he took for carrying them into effect. When the London and Birmingham Railway Company was formed, Mr. Sturge was chosen as one of the directors soon after the commencement of the undertaking. In such a position, it was not possible that a question of so much importance as that of Sunday travelling should fail to engage the early attention of one who sought to guide himself in whatever business he was concerned in by the law of conscience. And when he was led to the conclusion that such a use of the Company's means of locomotion was not right, no considerations of interest, or of the obloquy to which he should be exposed by adopting such a course, could deter him from endeavouring to give a practical effect to his convictions. It must be remarked, however, that he did not oppose Sunday travelling on what are called high Sabbatarian views. It is well known that the Society of Friends do not acknowledge the perpetual obligation of the Jewish Sabbath, nor do they recognise any special sanctity, as attaching to particular days, under the Christian dispensation. But they do very earnestly maintain the duty of setting apart some portion of our time for religious purposes, 'and as there is no sanctity in any day, and no obligation to appropriate one day rather than another, that which is actually fixed upon is the best and the right one.'* These views, of course, entirely preclude the idea of enforcing Sunday observance by legislation, or of claiming any divine right for urging abstinence from labour on that day. But though Mr. Sturge distinctly disclaimed taking these grounds, there were other reasons

* *Dymond's Essays*, p. 106.

sufficient in his opinion to justify the attempts he made to prevent the great Company to which he belonged from using their power and example to promote Sunday traffic. In the first place, it would necessitate the employment of a large number of persons, who would be thereby deprived of their day of rest, of the means of Christian worship and instruction, and of the opportunities which working men can have only on Sundays of enjoying intercourse with their families, and of promoting the religious education of their children. He, further, felt the greatest repugnance to imposing upon persons employed by the Company, who might have religious scruples against working on Sunday, and who were likely, certainly, not to be the least valuable and trustworthy servants, the alternative of violating their conscience, or of relinquishing their occupation. And, finally, he attached great value to the moral effect on the character and habits of the people of a day of rest and religious observance, and strongly deprecated whatever had a tendency to break down so salutary a custom. Such being his convictions, so soon as the first portion of the line was about to be opened in 1836, he proposed to his brother directors, 'that the Company's engines and carriages be not used on a Sunday, during the partial opening of the railway.' This motion was lost by a majority of one, as was a second motion of similar purport submitted to the same body, about a year later. The division of sentiment being thus so nearly equal among the directors, it was deemed necessary to refer the question to the suffrages of the proprietors. This was done on June 30, 1837, when Mr. Sturge moved a resolution to the same effect as the one above cited. He was sustained by upwards of 1,500 votes; but a still larger

number voted in favour of an amendment for only 'partially closing the railway on a Sunday, with a view of preventing travelling during the hours of divine service.' Nothing could have been more temperate and charitable than the spirit in which Mr. Sturge brought forward his proposal. This, however, did not save him from being bitterly assailed by a portion of the public press. Much is said about religious intolerance, but there is such a thing as irreligious intolerance, which can show itself, to say the least quite as fierce and fanatical, and as incapable of making any candid allowance for the judgment and conscience of others. Mr. Sturge, however, was not a man to be deterred by this kind of reproach from persevering in a course which he conceived to be right in principle and conducive to the general good. When, therefore, a sufficient time had been allowed for testing the experiment of partial restriction on Sunday travelling adopted by the proprietors, he determined to give them an opportunity of reconsidering their decision. It was found, of course, that the system of partial restriction did not remove, and hardly even mitigated, the evils on which his objections were founded. Accordingly, on March 8, 1838, he once more brought the question before the proprietors at a general meeting and asked them to consent to, at least, an experiment of nine or ten months of the principle for which he contended. A few extracts from the speech he delivered on that occasion will suffice to show the grounds on which and the spirit in which he advocated the measure:—

'He said he felt it due to himself to state the views and convictions on which he brought the subject before the meeting. He was no advocate for legislative enactments

this subject; and if he legislated at all, he would legislate as strictly for the rich as for the poor. But this was a very different question; it was whether a great trading company should employ their servants and carry on their business on Sundays.'

Having adverted at some length to 'the two main considerations' that had been brought forward by those who opposed him, 'the one of profit, and the other of necessity,' he proceeds to consider the hardship inflicted upon those in the employment of the Company, by their being obliged to work on the Sunday without regard to their conscience or convenience, in support of which he read extracts from memorials, four or five of which had just been presented to the board of directors by the clerks, porters, policemen, &c., employed on the different stations. He then adds:—

'It was, however, upon the moral and religious view of the question alone that he had been induced to trouble the proprietors with the present motion. It was well known that even the habit of putting on a clean dress once a week had a good moral effect on the working classes; but partial employment on the Sunday was found frequently not only to prevent this, but also the attendance on a place of worship. It should be recollected, moreover, that among the working classes Sunday was the great day for the education of their children; and the example of a parent leaving his house to attend to every-day employment must have a most injurious effect on his children. Indeed, he attached so much importance to the observance of the Sabbath, that he considered the moral elevation of this country in a great measure depended upon it; and the example of such a Company as this, either for good or evil, must be very powerful. All that he asked in the present motion was to throw the *onus probandi* on the public as to the necessity of throwing open the railway for their use on that day. The present being the most favourable moment for trying the experiment, he was most

desirous that such an opportunity should not be missed, he felt that the proposition of those who advocated a partial opening of the railway on the Sabbath was not only unsound in principle, but unsatisfactory and impracticable in an attempt to carry it into effect. Before he sat down, he might perhaps be permitted to observe that, on a former occasion when this question was discussed in London, something of an angry feeling was exhibited by those who opposed his view though he could scarcely see on what ground; but in discussing this question, while he claimed the exercise of the right of private judgment in coming forward in the present instance from a sense of duty, he trusted he had done so with perfect charity towards those who differed from him in opinion and with an entire feeling of goodwill.'

The result of the motion was, after a scrutiny of votes, that while 3,621 voted for it, 7,486 voted against it. This division being, of course, perfectly conclusive as to the judgment of the proprietors, Mr. Sturge felt that he had no right further to press his opinions upon them; and as he could not with a free conscience, quote his words in his letter of resignation, 'be a representative of a body who had decided upon a course which he conceived to involve an incalculable extent of moral evil, he retired from the board with a full acknowledgment of the courtesy he had experienced even from those directors whose opinions had differed from his own.'

When Birmingham received its charter of incorporation under the Municipal Act of 1835, the eyes of fellow-citizens were soon turned to Mr. Sturge as a fitting person to represent them in the town council and to aid in the administration of their local affairs. At the close of the year 1838, without any solicitation on his own part, and during his absence from town, he was elected as alderman of Thomas's Ward. This appointment

ment placed him in a position of some perplexity, for while unwilling to decline the trust committed to him by the spontaneous votes of his neighbours, there were certain declarations exacted of those who should serve on the council which he could not conscientiously take. Not merely as a member of the Society of Friends, but from strong personal conviction, he was opposed to church establishments; and although he held that, as he did all his other opinions, with perfect charity towards those who differed from him, yet he held it also with unwavering firmness and decision. When, therefore, he was required, as a test of admission to municipal office, to profess his determination not to use any power that might thus fall into his hands to the disadvantage of the Protestant church, *as established by law*, he felt he could not do this without some compromise of principle. To save his own consistency, therefore, and at the same time, no doubt, to signify by a practical protest that he disapproved the imposition of such a sectarian test as a barrier in the way of any class of the community to the full enjoyment of the rights of free citizenship, he resolved, whatever the legal consequences to himself might be, to accept the nomination of his fellow-townsmen, and to act in the office to which they had designated him without subscribing the declaration in question. His reasons for so acting were stated in the following address:—

‘TO THE BURGESSES OF THOMAS’S WARD.

‘Although not insensible to your kindness in choosing me to represent you in the town council, I may acknowledge I hold the opinion that when the duty is faithfully performed, the *electors*, not the *elected*, are the obliged party; and I would rather prove by my actions than professions that I deserve your confidence. I could not satisfactorily have undertaken

the office, unless placed there by your *unbiassed* votes; therefore I was not sorry that another engagement occasioned my absence from town on the morning of the election. On the day of my nomination I publicly stated I could not subscribe to one of the declarations required on taking office; and having acted upon this resolution, I consider it my duty to explain why I have pursued this course. The following are the usual declarations:—

“I, A. B., having been elected (alderman or councillor, as the case may be) for the borough of Birmingham, do hereby declare I take the office upon myself, and will duly and faithfully fulfil the duties thereof, according to the best of my ability.”

“I, A. B., do solemnly and seriously, in the presence of God, profess, testify, and declare, upon the true faith of a Christian, that I will never exercise any power, authority, or influence which I may possess by virtue of the office of councillor or alderman, as the case may be, to injure, weaken, or disturb the Protestant Church, as it is by law established in England, or to disturb the said Church, or the bishops or clergy of the said Church, in the possession of any rights or privileges to which such Church, or the said bishops or clergy, are or may be by law entitled.”

“The former declaration I have taken, but I have concluded not to act without subscribing to the latter, which I consider a recognition of the rights of church establishments; the latter I believe to be opposed to the spirit of the Gospel dispensation, and although I may not have to support the opinion, as an alderman, I deem it unsafe to draw a distinction between my actions as a private individual, and those I perform in virtue of any office I hold.

‘I am, very respectfully,

‘JOSEPH STURGEON

‘Edgbaston: 1st month, 1st, 1839.’

Soon after his acceptance of this office, a painful event occurred at Birmingham which obliged Mr. Sturgeon, according to his own conviction of duty, to take an active part in defence of what he deemed the violated

rights of his fellow-citizens. There was a good deal of distress in the manufacturing districts about the period in question. This led to much political agitation among the working classes. In Birmingham they were accustomed to meet to discuss their rights and grievances at a place called the 'Bull Ring,' an open space in the centre of the town, a portion of which is occupied by St. Martin's church. The demands of the people, as interpreted by the class of extreme reformers then very active in the country, had been embodied in an instrument well known as 'The National Petition.' Those who advocated the claims put forward in this document were divided into two parties, one of which favoured, and the other repudiated, a resort to physical force as a means of acquiring their political rights. The former party was represented by a body called the National Convention, at the head of which was Mr. Feargus O'Connor. In May 1839, this body transferred its sittings from London to Birmingham, which of course gave a new impulse to the agitation already existing. The magistrates, alarmed by the violent and menacing language employed by some of the speakers at the Bull Ring meetings, had already, previous to the arrival of the convention in the town, issued more than one warning, commanding persons to refrain from attending such meetings. Finding that this did not produce the desired effect, and apprehending that the presence of the delegates to the convention would probably embolden those who were disposed to follow violent counsels, they had, by anticipation, strengthened the military force, and also sworn in a large body of special constables. Not satisfied, however, with these precautions, some of them, in an evil hour, solicited and obtained the aid of a body of the London police, which

came down to Birmingham on July 4, 1839. On that very evening these men were marched to the Bull Ring while the meeting was being held, and although there was, on that occasion, no appearance of disorderliness nor any inflammatory speeches delivered, they made a rush on the people, who, at the first onset, fled in all directions, and were pursued by the police. The latter appear to have made very free use of their staves, even before any show of resistance was offered to them in performance of their duty. As, however, in the impetuosity of their pursuit, they became widely dispersed, the populace were gradually emboldened to resent the violence that had been used against them. They began to rally in groups, and to throw stones and brickbats at their assailants, who were in turn seized with a panic, and fled precipitately for refuge within the gates of the Public Office. But they did not gain this shelter until some of them had been severely wounded. This unfortunate collision greatly exasperated both parties. The London police, in particular, in their eagerness to avenge their defeat and maltreatment, seem to have acted as though something like martial law were in force—all civil rights utterly at an end—and the persons, and almost the lives of the working people of the town, placed at their mercy. Decent, orderly mechanics, whilst walking the streets on their lawful business, were rudely ordered to 'move on;' some were violently pushed forward, or received blows to quicken their pace; others were knocked down, and not a few were severely beaten while on the ground. Even their own firesides afforded them no security; outer doors were forced, and houses entered, without any lawful authority.* The feelings of the working classes were

* Report of the Committee appointed by the Town Council.

greatly embittered by these indignities and outrages inflicted upon them by a body of strangers, brought from a distance, as it appeared to them, to overawe and insult them at their own doors. July 15th was the day appointed by the extreme popular party for observing what they called their 'national holiday,' when the people were simultaneously and everywhere to desist from labour. On that day considerable numbers of working men assembled in various parts of Birmingham. They did so with no deliberate purpose of violence. But there can be little doubt that resentment against the London police was smouldering fiercely in their bosoms. This was fanned into a flame by certain additional acts of aggression committed by the same body on the day in question. The populace, at first, restricted themselves to tearing down the wooden pales of some gardens, and converting the fragments into weapons. But, as is almost invariably the case in such popular demonstrations, when the mischief was once let loose it passed out of the control of those with whom it originated, and who probably meant to keep it within bounds, and was eagerly seized upon by a mob of boys, and thieves, and ragamuffins, who always prowl about the streets of large towns, and converted to mere purposes of riot and plunder. Windows were smashed, shops were burst open, a bonfire was kindled, and finally two dwelling-houses were burnt to the ground. The rioters were, however, soon dispersed, several were captured, brought to trial, found guilty, and left for execution. Mr. Sturge had frequently, during this period of excitement in the town, personally interposed to calm the agitation of the multitude, by appearing in their meetings and earnestly entreating them to beware of following the counsels of those who

would incite them to violence. The respect felt for his character, and the confidence reposed in the sincerity of his sympathies for the working men, enabled him to exercise a most salutary influence on this class of his fellow-citizens, and did much, it is believed, to mitigate the evil he could not wholly prevent. When the crisis was over, his first efforts were directed to save the lives of the unfortunate men who were condemned to die for their share in the riot. By indefatigable exertions, he succeeded in getting their sentence commuted to transportation. His attention was next turned to the causes of the late disturbances. He had a strong conviction that the people were not wholly to blame for the unhappy events which had brought so much danger and dishonour on the town. He moved, therefore, the appointment of a committee by the town council to investigate the causes of the riot. He was elected chairman of this committee, which, after an elaborate enquiry, presented an able report to the council, in which they declared explicitly their belief that the disorders, which all so much deplored, were owing partly, no doubt, to the inflammatory language which about that time was addressed from platform and press to the working classes, but also in a very main degree to the misconduct of the London police. They, furthermore, severely censured the magistrates for having made the services of these men the subject of complimentary notice.

But the riots at Birmingham led to action on the part of the Government, to which Mr. Sturge felt himself called upon to offer the most strenuous resistance. At the time to which we are now referring, the local government of the town seemed to have been in a state of transition between the old and new system of municip

law. First, there were the ancient Headborough and manorial constables, quite unsuited to the modern wants of a great town. Afterwards, these were associated with, but not governed by, commissioners appointed by act of parliament, whose duties related to the streets, and markets, and town hall. Then came the charter of incorporation, and the grant of a borough commission of the peace. Under these royal grants there were a borough council and a set of local magistrates added to the previous local authorities. It may be readily imagined how much confusion arose from such a variety of governing and administrative bodies, with occasional conflicts of function between them.

The Birmingham riots of 1839 were, no doubt, partially traceable to these causes, for on that occasion the London police were brought down by invitation from the magistrates, when, if the town council had been consulted, the probability is they would not have been sent for.

After the riots, the Government brought forward a bill in parliament for vesting in the town council power to levy a rate and constitute an efficient police force. But suddenly, and without cause assigned, this bill was withdrawn and a new one substituted, putting the entire control of the force into the hands of a commissioner, to be appointed by the Home Secretary of State. This measure, sufficiently objectionable in itself, was rendered still more so by the way in which it was smuggled through parliament at the close of the session, and by what was something very like an underhand trick, involving a violation of good faith and honourable understanding. No man had a more thorough aversion than Mr. Sturge to any encroachment on the liberty of the subject, or to any approach to the

assumption of despotic power on the part of the Government. When, therefore, he became aware of the provisions of this Act, he threw himself into opposition to it with all the ardour and energy of his nature, and all the more because he found some others, under the influence of the panic occasioned by the recent disturbances in the town, disposed to barter their local rights for a temporary sense of security. A large public meeting was held at the town hall, consisting principally of working men. Most of those members of the middle classes who were wont to take the lead in political and municipal affairs carefully held aloof, and many persons indulged in dire forebodings that the meeting would end in tumult and riot. Some of Mr. Sturge's own friends earnestly besought him to abstain from taking any part in the proceedings. But he had the strongest conviction that to shrink from the side of the working men at such a moment, and to suffer an arbitrary measure to pass unchallenged because it might seem at the time to bear most hardly against *their* liberties, was not only ungenerous, but was the sure way to aggravate all the evils that were apprehended, by deepening the alienation already existing between them and the rest of their fellow-citizens. Mr. Sturge, therefore, not only attended the meeting but, contrary to his wont, consented to take a conspicuous part in the arrangements by moving one of the principal resolutions. The good effects of his presence soon became apparent. When one of the working men stood forward to move an amendment relating to the franchise, which would have diverted attention from the question in hand and verified the prognostications of their opponents, Mr. Sturge interposed, and, in a few kind words, appealed to the good

sense of the audience not to give their enemies an occasion to triumph, which would certainly be the case if they were, by any side-wind, to frustrate the object of the meeting. He added, that if the working men wished to call a meeting for the franchise, and they had any difficulty to procure that hall, he would pay all expense and guarantee any damage that might be done. On this, the proposer and seconder withdrew their amendment, and the original resolution was carried without a dissentient voice.

To show the grounds on which Mr. Sturge acted on this occasion, we cannot do better than cite a few sentences from the speech he delivered at the town hall meeting. The Government Act he described as

‘A measure by which the minister of the day placed within their town a large body of men, drilled and organised, under the control of a Commissioner appointed by him, and who also acted as a Justice of the Peace, with between forty and fifty officers of various grades below him. This force he could order to act without a moment’s notice, with deadly weapons, without even reading the Riot Act, as in the case of the military. If they did not implicitly obey, the Secretary of State could at any moment supplant any of the body, from the lowest to the highest. The principles on which this despotic measure are based are so entirely repugnant to justice, sound policy, and the British constitution, that had it not been hurried through Parliament at the very close of the session, under the worst possible misrepresentations, and when the ministers and their dependents constituted the majority of the members in attendance, bad as was the present House of Commons, he could hardly believe that it could have escaped. . . . Contrary to the opinion entertained by some, although the entire control of the police was vested in some agent of the Government of the day, the whole of the expense was to be paid by a local tax upon the town.

. . . He knew there were so many alarmed at the present state of things that they were ready to give up a portion of their liberty for the sake of what they called security; but that security, it would be recollected, was to be procured by the introduction of an armed police, and the adoption of measures which alienated the feelings of the great mass of the working classes. They might suppress the expression of public opinion for a time, but they must be conscious that without doing justice to the people, they were treading on a smothered volcano. He also knew there were some who considered that the few and the wealthy should govern the poor and the many; but he could not find in his Bible, either in the doctrine and example of Him whom all Christians professed to follow, a single passage to justify such an opinion or such a practice. It was the conviction of Christian duty which had brought him there that day, and which told him that he should resist by all possible means such measures as the Government Police Bill. He felt that he would not be obeying the injunctions of his Divine Master, "to love his neighbour as himself," if he did not use any little influence which he might possess to prevent encroachments upon the liberties of his country, though they might not affect him personally; and it was also his duty to advocate the rights of the poorest individual in the community to all the religious, civil, and political privileges of the wealthiest in the land. Some might be disposed to blame him for promoting meetings such as the present at this time, but he so far differed from them that he firmly believed the public and constitutional expression of popular opinion at the present eventful period was their greatest—had almost said their only—safety. The severe censure cast upon the middle orders of society for their want of sympathy with the working classes, at some of the numerous meetings which had been held, had produced an effect which he was concerned and alarmed him; and whilst he would earnestly appeal to all of the former class to remove every ground of complaint, he would warn his working friends against listening too readily to such representations.'

Without further pursuing the history of this agitation, suffice it to say, that after a rather obstinate resistance, public sentiment ultimately obliged the Government to give way, and to allow local control to come into operation in the management of the local police.

Mr. Sturge was not mistaken in the apprehension that he would be severely blamed for the part he acted on this occasion. It was natural enough, of course, that at such a moment of intense excitement the leaders and organs of political party should assail him with great vehemence. For a professed liberal to place himself in such broad opposition to the Whig, or, as it was still the fashion then to call it, the Reform Ministry, was an act of unpardonable disloyalty in the estimation of that class, then much more numerous than it is now, who cherished a sort of blind traditional allegiance to the Whig party. It is probable, however, that Mr. Sturge was very little disturbed by *their* censure. But there was another class whose disapproval he felt much more keenly. Among his own intimate personal friends, who loved and esteemed him most highly, there were some who felt great solicitude lest his moral and religious character should suffer damage, from his being drawn too much into the perilous vortex of politics. It was an unfounded apprehension so far as he was concerned, for his politics sprung so directly from his sense of Christian obligation, that they may be said to have formed part of his religion. In answer to a dear friend and relative, who had addressed him, apparently, in a tone of remonstrance and warning on this subject, he wrote as follows :—

‘I am much obliged, my dear brother, for thy kind and friendly advice about the police affair, and not the less so because I cannot agree with thee in opinion. If we talked

the matter over together, there is probably one point of principle on which we might differ considerably. I believe thou art inclined increasingly to doubt the propriety of Christians taking any part in political matters; while I am rather increasingly of opinion that they are not only justified, but that when called upon by their fellow-citizens they are bound to do so, unless it interfere with other and paramount claims upon them, or unless the position in which it places them *necessarily* involves a compromise of religious principle. But granting that I was not wrong in accepting a seat in the corporation, I think I could show thee pretty strong reasons why it was my duty to pursue the course I have with regard to the Government Police Bill. I was perfectly aware that by doing so I should expose myself to a good deal of censure from many quarters, and especially from almost the whole of the Unitarian body, and those who have a strong political bias in favour of the present ministry. But in reviewing what I have done, while I am too conscious of my great weakness and many infirmities to suppose that I have in all cases, both in word and manner, adopted the best mode of conveying my sentiments, I can see no ground to believe that I have been acting contrary to my Christian duty in the general course I have pursued. It is not the first time on which I have felt that, in following that line of apprehended duty, I must be prepared, if needful, to sacrifice the approbation of some wise and good men; and all I would ask of those whom I love and esteem, and whose good opinion I would not needlessly forfeit, is that they would not be biassed by mere prejudiced or newspaper statements, but suspend their judgments till they really know the facts, so as to be able to understand the merits of the case. What has lately got into some of the papers reminds me strongly of the censures cast upon me by the colonial pro-slavery press during our late anti-slavery struggle. I am sorry to say that amongst some of the middle and higher class with us there is a feeling almost as bitter towards the working classes as there was towards the slave by the slaveowners. I am writing in great haste now, and feel that it would be quite

out of the question attempting to go fully into the subject; but I was not willing to omit writing a line to express a hope thou wouldst suspend thy opinion till thou had an opportunity of knowing the real facts, and at the same time to assure thee of my gratitude for thy kind and affectionate expressions of caution. I know the dangerous path in which I am treading, and in the midst of its difficulties and temptations it is, indeed, a comfort to know that thou and some others are watching over me for good, and that when you think it is needful, you will not withhold a word of faithful admonition and counsel.'

To the same friend he writes in another letter, dated '8 mo. 22, 1839:—

'The difficulty for a true Christian to act consistently while engaged in political matters is no doubt very great. But this is not a sufficient ground for him to desert his post, if in the ordering of Providence he is placed in such a situation, so long, at least, as he can fill it without any compromise of religious principle. The other alternative leads to consequences which many who take it up do not, I believe, at first sight perceive; for I think that, if carried out consistently, it must lead to a withdrawal from all active exertions for the amelioration of the miseries of mankind, and appears to me to be at variance with that part of our Saviour's prayer for His disciples, "I pray not that Thou shouldest take them out of the world, but that Thou shouldest keep them from the evil." Indeed, it would leave the devil in undisputed possession of many things which vitally affect the prosperity of nations and the spiritual and temporal welfare of the whole human family; and I think it possible to carry on civil government without violating the spirit of the texts thou hast quoted.'

CHAPTER XIII.

ANTI-CORN-LAW AGITATION. CHINA WAR.

Mr. Sturge very early a Free Trader—Letters from Mr. Villiers and Lord Brougham—Joins the League from its first Formation—Letters from Mr. J. B. Smith and Mr. Cobden—Attends the Free-Trade Conventions—Special Services to the Movement—Helped to give it a Moral and Religious Tone—And to ensure simple Adherence to Principle—Mr. Cobden's Appreciation of his Services in this respect—Letter from Mr. Cobden—Jealousy of any Departure from Principle—Difference with the Leaguers on the Sugar Question—Letter of Mr. O'Connell—*Jeu d'esprit* of Mr. Cobden.—Mr. Sturge's own Views on the Subject—The China War—History of the Opium Traffic—Mr. Sturge's strong Abhorrence of it—His Appeal to the Public—Meeting at Freemasons' Hall—Later Exertions in the same Cause.

WHEN Mr. Sturge was being trained up in his early youth to a farmer's life, he was also, no doubt, duly inoculated with those ideas on the necessity of protection which at that time so absolutely possessed the agricultural mind. His father, so far as he concerned himself at all in politics, was a strong Tory, and we have heard his son on more than one occasion, in reference to the very decided course in an opposite direction taken by himself and his brothers in after life, pleasantly wonder how the excellent man would have felt had he lived long enough to see what a set of uncompromising radicals he had bred. We have already seen how early Mr. Sturge had become a convert to the doctrines of free trade. Apart from what we may call a constitutional tendency of his mind towards liberal ideas on all subjects, his experience in the corn trade

had no doubt greatly contributed to the result. It is easy to see that laws such as then existed, which converted traffic in the primè necessary of human life into a species of gambling, must have been, both on moral and commercial grounds, utterly unacceptable to a man of his principles. We are prepared, therefore, to find that as soon as he was partially relieved from the paramount claims of the Anti-slavery cause by the abolition of the apprenticeship, he began more and more to turn his ear to the cry that was gradually rising from the heart of the nation against that system of restriction on the importation of the people's food which, as few knew better than himself, pressed so cruelly on the industry and energy of the country. There was a personal reason also that drew him towards this agitation. Mr. Villiers had been one of his most faithful associates in his struggle for the liberation of the slave. It was very natural, therefore, that he should be anxious to do all in his power to strengthen the hands of that gentleman in those assaults upon the corn laws which for some years he so gallantly sustained in the face of a hostile ministry and an unsympathising House of Commons. In a letter dated August 15, 1838, Mr. Villiers writes to him :—

‘ Before I left London I put a notice on the books to this effect, that I would call the attention of the House to the taxes that raised the price of food, contracted the commerce of the country, limited the demand for labour, lowered the profit upon capital, and yielded nothing to the revenue. I will take the earliest opportunity in the next session to bring the matter on with the view to a motion for the total repeal of such taxes, which I conceive to be imposed by the corn laws. I am determined to ask for nothing short of this, because they are in *principle* opposed to justice and sound

policy, and are yearly threatening this country with tremendous evils. I have upon more than one occasion stated in the House my determination to bring on the question of the corn laws at the earliest opportunity next session.

‘Yours most truly,

‘C. P. VILLIERS.’

It was, no doubt, with a view to support Mr. Villiers’ motion that Mr. Sturge contemplated the public meeting at Birmingham, to which the following letter from Lord Brougham refers, dated ‘Penrith, September 29, 1838.’

‘DEAR JOSEPH STURGE,—I heartily rejoice at your coming into the corn law controversy. I regard you as already a veteran, and a veteran who has gained a great victory; and I hereby constitute and appoint you my lieutenant-general against those equally vile and silly corn-laws. I am ready, of course, to do my duty, but I much doubt if my going to Birmingham would serve the cause so well as presiding at a *London* meeting, which I am quite ready to do, and had promised to do before getting your letter. One reason against Birmingham is that I have no connexion with the place; and I think it always a doubtful thing if any person should *itinerate* to agitate. When the people on the spot are prepared to take part of themselves, *they* should do it. No harm can come of this. The other is liable to much abuse; but if it is still deemed that I am wrong, I promise to reconsider it.

‘Yours very sincerely,

‘H. BROUGHAM.’

When the first germ of that great association for the repeal of the corn laws sprung up, which afterwards, under the name of the ‘League,’ grew into such power and fame, Mr. Sturge was one of the earliest to attach himself to it. He was, no doubt, well disposed to do so of his own accord, and the leaders of that body, who

were men of eminent practical sagacity, were no less anxious to secure his adhesion. The high respect in which his character was held throughout the country, the *prestige* which at that time surrounded his name as the hero of an agitation, which had proved so recently and so signally successful, and the great experience he had acquired in evoking and directing popular opinion to the accomplishment of a given object, made those gentlemen fully sensible of the great advantage it would be to their cause to enlist such a man actively in their ranks. Accordingly we find that, almost from the first, he was in frequent communication with Mr. Cobden, Mr. J. B. Smith, Mr. Duncan Maclaren, and other prominent members of the League, who sought his counsel in all their movements, and relied greatly upon his cooperation, especially as respects the important district of which Birmingham was the centre.

The following extract of a letter from Mr. J. B. Smith, dated January 31, 1839, referring to the first meeting of delegates held in London, shows how intimately Mr. Sturge was associated with the movement, even at that early period. Its allusion to Sir R. Peel is rather remarkable, when we remember that it was made six years before the events which it seems almost prophetically to foreshadow actually took place:—

‘I am rather uneasy that I have not heard from you respecting Brown’s hotel. I should very much like to have an hour’s conversation with you on my way to London. Perhaps you could meet us at the railway station in Birmingham, so that we may have a few words together. Our deputies go to-morrow for the purpose of seeing some of our friends and making preparations for the Monday meeting. We hear that ministers mean to propose a fixed duty and grant us a committee. This, we think, would be to

cushion the whole business, and we do not mean to submit to it. Nothing will do but total and immediate repeal, and if they are not prepared to grant that, then we ought in justice to be heard by witnesses at the bar of the House. We are determined to oppose every ministry who deny us repeal, and let no candidate show his face here again who does not vote for it. . . . Sir Robert Peel has a fine opportunity if he chooses to come out for total repeal; he would have all the manufacturing interests throwing up their caps for him, but what would the chaw-bacon Tories say to it? Would there not be a cry of "treachery again"? Hoping to see you on Monday,

'I remain,

'Truly yours,

'J. B. SMITH.'

It is well known that Mr. Villiers' motion, made on the 18th February, proposing that the advocates of repeal should be heard at the bar of the House, was rejected by a large majority. Mr. Sturge, mindful of his own success on the Anti-slavery question by similar tactics, was anxious that the question should be brought forward again the same session in another form. To this proposal Mr. Cobden refers in a letter, dated May 30, 1839:—

'You suggest that we should try the question again. But how? Will the attention of the factions be called to the corn laws by any efforts of ours this session? I fear not. I wish you would see Mr. Villiers or else advise with some other judicious M.P., and ask them whether it would be advisable for us to try the question again in any shape this session. We fear it would not be possible to bring up our friends the delegates again this year in sufficient force to command attention to our case. But if we work up the towns by lectures, and send up a million of signatures against the corn laws next spring, we may bother even Sir Robert next session. Still if the discussion can be again

brought on, either directly or indirectly, this session, it might do good. I think the case of the Shetlands might in the right hands be made a powerful one to rouse the sympathies of the public.

‘Yours very truly,

‘R. COBDEN.’

From this time forward, Mr. Sturge was for some years invariably present as the representative of Birmingham at those large meetings of delegates, constituting a sort of second and unofficial parliament, which were wont to assemble sometimes in London, and sometimes at Manchester, to promote the repeal of the corn laws.

But there were, we think, some special services which he rendered to the cause of free trade. In the first place, he helped to give something of a moral and religious tone to the movement, and to prevent it from degenerating into a mere commercial and economical agitation. Not that he was insensible to the immense importance of the subject in its bearing on the trading interests of the country. Still, it was the moral aspect of every question that appealed most strongly to his nature, and he seldom failed at the meetings of the League to keep before the eyes of his colleagues the fact, that the system against which they were contending was evil, not merely because it crippled our manufactures and interfered with the free course of commerce, but because it contravened the laws of God and strove, by perverse human legislation, to frustrate the beneficent designs of Providence. We find a characteristic illustration of this in the account given by Mr. Prentice, in his ‘History of the League,’ of the interview which a deputation from the delegates, who met in London in 1840, held with Mr. Baring, then Chancellor of the

Exchequer, and Mr. Labouchere, then President of the Board of Trade. After various speakers had shown how disastrously the corn laws were operating on the material prosperity of the country, as evidenced by the bitter and wide-spread sufferings of that terrible year, he adds that then 'Joseph Sturge made a powerful appeal to the ministers, placing the whole question upon the eternal principles of justice and humanity, which, he said, were shamefully outraged by a tax on the food of the people.' We believe that Mr. Sturge did another signal service to the cause of free trade during these early years of agitation. At one of the first meetings of delegates held in Manchester for the purpose of constituting the Anti-Corn-Law association, the question had to be discussed as to the principle or fundamental article of faith which should be adopted as the basis of union. Mr. Sturge strongly urged them to take, as the ground of their appeal to the country, nothing less than the total and immediate abolition of the corn laws.

'I remember,' says one of the leaders of the League, in a letter to the biographer, 'how little the great majority were prepared for anything so strong and uncompromising, and how gladly nine-tenths of us would have avoided the question at the time. But I believe that it was our late friend who, fresh from the experience of the Anti-slavery struggle, pointed out the necessity of taking our stand on the rock of abstract truth and justice; and I must say we found it our rock of safety during our seven years' struggle.'

Mr. Sturge seems to have ever after watched with jealous vigilance to keep the association true to its original pledge. In all large bodies like that into which the League gradually grew, there will always be found a class who shrink from the full and firm main-

tenance of a principle, and are for ever counselling surrender on some plea of compromise. There seems to have been a time in the history of the Anti-Corn-Law movement, when the influence of this class threatened to turn the body aside from the broad path of right to the entangling bye-ways of expediency. This was especially the case when a considerable Whig element got infused among them, who wished to subordinate what they saw was becoming a power in the country to the purposes of their own party. But from his experience in the Anti-slavery agitation, Mr. Sturge had learnt utterly to distrust such compromises as tending only to distract and bewilder the public mind, and to weaken by dividing the force of those who were demanding justice, while they left the root of the evil still in possession of the soil. He was determined therefore that, so far as he could prevent it, he would not permit his colleagues to swerve from the high ground which from the first he had persuaded them to assume. He thus became a sort of conscience to the League, taking alarm and giving warning at what he deemed the first sign of deflection from the right, and no doubt proving, as a sensitive conscience is very apt to do, rather troublesome and irritating in moments of strong temptation and of wavering virtue. The following letter from Mr. Cobden will show the importance he attached to Mr. Sturge's influence in this direction. In order to understand some of the allusions it contains we must premise that, when Mr. Sturge was on the point of paying a visit to America, he wrote to the Council of the League promising to double his subscription of 100*l.* a year, on the distinct understanding that they were on no account to yield up the principle of total and immediate abolition :—

'Manchester: February 20, 1841.

'MY DEAR STURGE,—When I got your favour of the 22nd of January, making the munificent offer of contributing 200*l.*, instead of 100*l.*, for the current year's agitation of the Anti-Corn-Law question, I wrote to you to beg you would address a letter to the "Circular" to that effect, and at the same time impress on the League the importance of cleaving to the TRUE principle of *immediate abolition*. I thought that such a letter from *you* would do much good, and I think so still. Indeed, it is now more than ever necessary that we should cling to our principle, when parties (I mean the two great political parties) are so nearly balanced that both are beginning to turn their eye towards us. The Whigs are trying to *use* the League; and there are so many of our supporters who are mere partisans that I am afraid they will break our ranks, unless such men as you should keep us together. A letter from you in the "Anti-Corn Law Circular," published at the present time, exhorting us to stand firm to principle, and promising your cooperation so long as we do so, would be a rallying-point for all the good and true men, and would shame the wanderers, and bring them back to our ranks.

'In your letter, received to-day, you surprise me by mentioning your project of a trip across the Atlantic. I should sincerely regret your absence from England at any time, but it would be a very great public loss if you were in America during the time of the meeting of Anti-Corn Law deputies this spring. Efforts will, I know, be made to bring prominently forward the view that the slave system of the United States is being indirectly propped up by our corn laws; and I think it possible that a couple of deputies from America will attend the meeting of our deputations. To lose you at such a time would be to throw away the good that must arise from the right direction of this new movement. I have had some correspondence with the editor of the "New York Emancipator," and he tells me the Anti-slavery party there are trying to raise funds to send two missionaries to England to lay before the public here the effects of our corn laws in

reference to the slave question in the United States. I see by the "Massachusetts Abolitionist," that a similar movement is going on in the New England States. Now this is a glorious field of operations for you. There are more human beings in bonds in North America than in all the rest of the *Christian* world, and we by our corn laws throw the entire power over the legislature there into the hands of the *slave-owners*. What a splendid theme this would make for O'Connell and Brougham in the Anti-Corn-Law debate, if you were in London to urge the subject on their attention at the meeting of deputies. Don't, I entreat you, turn your back upon us at such a crisis. By remaining over our meeting of deputies, you will help most effectually to strike the shackles from the slaves in America, and from our white slaves here at the same time.

'Yours very truly,

'R. COBDEN.'

So jealous was Mr. Sturge of anything like even an appearance of vacillation on the question of principle to which he attached so much importance, that when, on his return from America, he found that the free-traders had not opposed but rather supported the proposal of the Whig Government for a fixed duty of eight shillings on wheat, he felt it right to address a letter publicly to Mr. Cobden, rather complaining of this course, and asking from him, 'who was so deservedly considered the leader and representative of the League in the House of Commons,' a renewed assurance 'that they neither have nor ever will relax from their efforts nor swerve from their purpose until they have obtained the complete removal of this disgraceful and cruel impost.' Mr. Cobden's explanation of the circumstances referred to, and his emphatic declaration that the council felt bound to adhere to the full principle of abolition, 'not less from a sense of duty than the con-

viction that it constituted their bond of union and the main source of their strength,' was entirely satisfactory to Mr. Sturge, and he resumed his place among the leaguers with his wonted earnestness and energy.

On one point, however, there was a wide divergence of opinion between him and the leaders of the League. Fidelity to the cause of the slave was with him paramount to all other obligations. When, therefore, the free-traders supported the measure introduced into parliament in 1841 for reducing the differential duty on slave-grown sugar, he differed from them wholly, and did not hesitate to proclaim and maintain his dissent with his usual boldness and tenacity.

It was no doubt a question sufficiently perplexing to those who were at once sincere Anti-slavery men and sincere free-traders, as was the case with many of those who joined in the controversy. It would be difficult, perhaps, to state the argument more forcibly on either side than is done in the following communications which Mr. Sturge received from two great masters of logic—Mr. O'Connell and Mr. Cobden. The former, as will be seen, adhered to the Anti-slavery view :—

'London : March 27, 1844.

'MY DEAR FRIEND,—I entirely agree with you on the sugar question, not viewing it as a subject of political economy, but, under the circumstances of the case, taken altogether. When the British nation gave 20,000,000*l.* to the persons called owners of slaves, they did so for the sake of humanity, but in direct violation of all rules of political economy; and it would be, in my mind, the most absurd of all absurd things to give 20,000,000*l.* sterling to get rid in our own colonies of all the cruelties necessarily incident to slavery, and then immediately after to open our markets to slave-grown sugar of other countries, and thus to hold out a bonus to those

countries to continue and increase all the horrors of negro slavery. It is, to my mind, a one-sided, left-handed humanity to free the negro in our own colonies and then to augment his sufferings in other countries.

‘It is said, “Will you be so cruel to the people of England as to refuse them cheap sugar?” I say, “Yes, I will, if the cheapness of the sugar is to be procured by shedding the blood of the negro.” I would not consent to give it to the people of England, nor of Ireland either, at the expense of robbery or stealing, and I will not consent to give it to them by the murder of the negro. If the throat of the negro was to be cut at once in the process of augmenting the produce of sugar canes, everybody would call that murder, and it is no less murder to cut his back with the lash, and to work him to a premature death, which are the necessary consequences of the production of sugar by negro slave-labour.’

‘As you see how entirely I agree with you on this subject, command my services at any time and in any place you please.’

‘It is no answer to say, “that we use slave-grown tobacco and slave-grown cotton.” My reply is, that I would prevent both if I possibly could. It is no reason at all that, because I cannot prevent two existing crimes, therefore I should consent to the commission of a third crime. Every law, human and divine, prohibits such conduct. I will prevent as much criminality as I can, and endeavour as much as possible to lessen that which I cannot prevent, leaving it in the hands of Providence to dispose the hearts of other men so as not anywhere to augment human misery.’

‘Believe me,

‘Very faithfully yours,

‘DANIEL O’CONNELL.’

Mr. Cobden, on the other hand, took the Free-trade views. Not that he differed from Mr. Sturge on the evils of slavery. In a letter written some years later, he says:—‘You and I do not disagree in our abhorrence

of slavery, nor do I yield to any one in sympathy for the victims of that sin, but we do differ as to the course which we ought to take, *by legislation*, in this country to put down the slave trade.' At the height of the controversy on this subject, wishing to convey his sense of the inconsistency of the position taken by Mr. Sturge and his party, in a manner that should be at once forcible and as little offensive as possible to the friend whose character he so deeply honoured, he determined to clothe his logic in a garb of humour, and therefore sent him the following *jeu d'esprit* :—

‘A SCENE AT THE BOARD OF TRADE.

‘*Lord Ripon and the Brazilian Ambassador sitting together.*

‘AMBASSADOR.—Your lordship is, doubtless, aware that the commercial treaty between England and Brazil is about to expire.

‘RIPON.—True ; and I am happy to find myself empowered to treat with your excellency for a renewal of the commercial relations between two countries so admirably calculated by nature to minister to the wealth and happiness of each other.

‘AMBASSADOR.—Brazil is favoured beyond almost any other country in its soil, climate, and the facilities of its internal communication. Its products are various, comprising hides, tallow, cotton, gems of a variety of kind, sugar—

‘RIPON.—I beg your excellency's pardon for interrupting you, but how is your sugar cultivated—by slave labour ?

‘AMBASSADOR.—It is.

‘RIPON.—Oh ! strike it out of the list, I beg ; we cannot take slave sugar ; it is contrary to the religious principles of the British people to buy slave-grown sugar—*it is stolen goods.*

‘AMBASSADOR.—I bow to your nation's honourable scruples. We will then omit the sugar. Still there are other commodities remaining in which we may effect a profitable exchange, and I hope to the benefit of both countries.

'RIPON.—Oh yes, there are plenty of articles of exchange which we shall still be happy to supply you with,—our irons, earthenware, silks, woollens, cottons—

'AMBASSADOR.—I beg pardon—did your lordship say cottons?

'RIPON.—Yes; we are the largest dealers in cotton-goods in the world, and we sell them so cheap that they find their way more or less into every country on the face of the earth: we supply Italy—

'AMBASSADOR.—I pray your lordship's pardon for again interrupting you, but may I ask how is the cotton cultivated; is it not by slave labour?

'RIPON.—Why—ahem! how is it cultivated, you say? Why—ahem! hem!—why—

'AMBASSADOR.—I believe I can relieve your lordship from your apparent embarrassment by answering that question. At least four-fifths of the cotton imported into England is of slave cultivation.

'RIPON.—Ahem! I believe it is so.

'AMBASSADOR.—Then am I to understand that your people have no religious scruple against selling slave-grown produce to the Brazilians?

'RIPON.—(Colours in his face, and moves about uneasily in his chair.)

'AMBASSADOR.—No religious scruples against sending slave-grown cottons into every country in the world!—no religious scruples against eating slave-grown rice!—no religious scruples against making slave-grown tobacco!—no religious scruples against taking slave-grown snuff! (pointing to a gold snuff-box lying on the table.) Am I to understand that the religious scruples of the English people are confined to the article of sugar?

'RIPON (putting the snuff-box in his pocket).—I am sorry to be obliged to repeat that I cannot consent to take your sugar.

'AMBASSADOR (rising from his seat).—My lord, I should be first to do homage to the sincere and consistent scruples of conscientious Christians. But whilst you are sending to Brazil sixty millions of yards of cotton goods in a year, I

cannot in justice to my own feelings sit quietly and listen to the plea that your nation has in reality any religious scruples upon the subject of slave labour. Excuse me if I suggest to your lordship that other reasons may be found, especially in the monopoly which your own colonial proprietors enjoy—

‘RIPON—(interrupting him).—I do assure your excellency that a body of religious men, the anti-slavery party, have urged these scruples upon Her Majesty's Government. I have to-day been waited upon by Joseph Sturge, one of the most influential of that body—

‘AMBASSADOR.—Joseph Sturge! I have heard of him and his labours in the cause of humanity. He is the consistent friend of the oppressed,—too consistent, I should hope, to urge upon his government, whilst making a treaty with the Brazils for receiving slave-grown cotton from your country, to refuse slave-grown sugar in exchange. Joseph Sturge is a believer in the New Testament, which teaches us to “remove the beam from our own eye before we cast out the mote from our neighbour's eye.” Does not Joseph Sturge oppose the introduction into this country of cotton, tobacco, and rice?

‘(The door opens, and enter Joseph Sturge, with a cotton cravat, his hat lined with calico, his coat, &c. sewed with cotton thread, and his cotton pockets well lined with slave-wrought gold and silver. The Brazilian Ambassador and Lord Ripon burst into laughter.)’

We have no purpose here to re-argue this vexed question, in respect to which it is but right to say, some very earnest anti-slavery men did not concur in Mr. Sturge's views. It will suffice briefly to state in his own words the ground he took, and on which he believed he could reconcile his principles as a free-trader with the exceptional course he deemed it right to take on this particular question. In a letter to the ‘Anti-slavery Reporter,’ afterwards published separately, he says,—

‘England has expended not less than twenty millions sterling in subsidies, armed cruisers, &c., to suppress the slave-trade; Spain, Portugal, and Brazil have entered into the most solemn compacts to abolish it; and yet at the present hour these countries are pursuing the horrid traffic to an extent that daily sacrifices to death or slavery one thousand victims. At the very time that our Government were proposing to raise an annual revenue of more than half a million sterling by the introduction of Brazilian and Cuban sugars, for the cultivation of which there would have been required an additional import from Africa of many thousand slaves annually, they were sending armed cruisers to seize as pirates the slavers engaged in supplying these victims. It has been asserted that to promote fiscal regulations to prevent the introduction of slave-grown produce, is inconsistent with the conviction that it is more costly than that of free labour; but in the luminous discussion in the Convention in London [in 1840] on the subject, it was conceded on all hands, that the slaveholder, by seizing upon the richest virgin soils, might for a time secure large profits by their cultivation, though with dreadful mortality to the human stock. To exclude from the country slave-grown sugar, is no more a denial of the undoubted superiority of free over slave labour, than the refusal of any other stolen goods that may be offered at a reduced price; for as slavery is robbery of the worst description, it is our duty to abstain from its fruits, both individually and nationally, irrespective of the cost of production. Our inconsistency in receiving cotton and some other articles, is no reason why laws already existing should be declared in favour of slave-grown sugar, and at a period when the arduous labours of half a century have resulted in the emancipation of our own colonies, and enabled us to obtain the unstained produce of freedom.

‘Were this a mere question of commercial competition, I should feel perfectly satisfied to await the period when free labour would, under every disadvantage, assert its natural ascendancy; but when the immolation of thousands of human beings must inevitably take place in the contest, I

feel bound to protest against the course it has been proposed to adopt. A pro-slavery writer has recently admitted that slaves in Cuba are worked to death at the rate of ten per cent. per annum, a destruction of life which, if extended to the whole human race, would soon depopulate the world.'

It is probable that this controversy, which lasted several years, tended somewhat to detach Mr. Sturge from his old free-trade associates, while the conviction that grew upon him, of the hopelessness of carrying any measures for the relief of the people without further organic reform, turned his attention more to the agitation for the suffrage, of which we shall presently have to speak more at large.

Before doing so, however, we must briefly notice one other effort put forth by him about this time in the field of philanthropy.

Towards the end of the year 1839, Mr. Sturge became deeply interested in the state of our relations with China. So far back as the year 1800, the Chinese Government had prohibited the importation of opium into the country, because, such were the words of the imperial edict, 'it was wasting the time and destroying the property of the people, and leading them to exchange their silver and commodities for the vile dirt brought in by the foreigners.' In spite of this, however, the East India Company continued the trade, and when its charter expired in 1834, private merchants pushed it with redoubled vigour, 'not only smuggling it in as our smugglers brought in brandy and gin, but making a lodgment in the country for the article, under shelter of the arrangements for the general trade at Macao and Canton.*' This contraband traffic, at length, was

* Miss Martineau's *History of the Thirty Years' Peace*, p. 484.

spreading to such an extent, was carried on with such open audacity, and was producing such disastrous effects on the health and character of the population, that the Government at Peking was determined to put a stop to it. After repeated warnings, which were wholly unheeded, a special commissioner was sent to Canton with summary powers to deal with the question, who on his arrival blockaded the European factories, and demanded that all the opium on the coast should be delivered up to him to be destroyed. Captain Elliot, then chief superintendent of trade, had no alternative but to obey, and more than 20,000 chests of the prohibited article were surrendered to the Chinese authorities, when the blockade was immediately raised and the foreigners set free. The Government at home, in the instructions they had sent out to Captain Elliot, had laid down this clear principle, that 'Her Majesty's Government cannot interfere, for the purpose of enabling British subjects to violate the laws of the country to which they trade. Any loss, therefore, which such persons may suffer, in consequence of the more effectual execution of the Chinese laws on this subject, must be borne by the parties who have brought that loss on themselves by their own acts.' In spite of this declaration, however, we went to war with the Chinese in defence of the opium smugglers, the best proof of which is afforded by the fact, that when the war was over we extorted from the Chinese Government 6,000,000 of dollars as compensation to the men whose daring 'violation of the laws of the country to which they traded' was the sole cause of the war. These transactions filled the mind of Joseph Sturge with the deepest sorrow and shame. The trade in opium, for which no defence ever has been or can be urged,

except that it is a *profitable* iniquity, always appeared to him hardly less infamous than the slave trade. And when he saw the strength and resources of this Christian country about to be employed in carrying fire and sword into the heart of a heathen empire, in support of so execrable a traffic, he was roused into a vehemence of indignation which led him to the employment of language such as he rarely permitted himself to use. He issued the following address on the subject :—

TO THE CHRISTIAN PUBLIC OF GREAT BRITAIN.

‘I may be accused of presumption in thus addressing you, but when the nation is about to be plunged into a disgraceful and expensive war, which must cast a reproach on the name of Christianity throughout the world, it becomes the duty of every individual, however humble, to raise his voice against it.

‘It is now too notorious to render needful entering at large into the subject, that the guilty traffic in opium, grown by the East India Company to be smuggled into China, at length compelled the Chinese Government to vindicate the laws of the empire which prohibit its introduction, and to take decisive measures for the suppression of the traffic by the arrest of the parties concerned in it at Canton, and the seizure and destruction of the opium found in the Chinese waters.* It is also well known that the superintendent of British trade (Capt. Elliot) so far compromised his official character and duty as to take under his protection one of the most extensive opium smugglers, and thus rendered himself justly liable to the penalties to which they were obnoxious; and at the same time gave, as far as was in his power, the sanction of the British nation to this unrighteous violation of the Chinese laws.

‘The following fact is, however, not so generally known. An individual now in this country, who had acquired immense wealth by this unlawful trade, has been in communication with the Government, and his advice, it is presumed, has in no

* See Thelwall's *Iniquities of the Opium Trade*, and King's *Opium Crisis*.

small degree influenced the measures they have adopted; though he is a *leading partner* in a firm to which a large proportion of the opium that was destroyed belonged; and at the very time he was claiming compensation, or urging a war with China, his house in India was sending *armed* vessels loaded with opium along the coast of China, and selling it in open defiance of the laws of that empire. This information, with the names of the vessels and the parties concerned, the number of chests of opium on board, the enormous profits they were realising, &c., was some time ago communicated to the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, on authority which he did not and could not dispute.

‘It is possible that the Government, and even a majority of Parliament, may resolve to trample upon laws human and divine in slaughtering the peaceable inhabitants of China, and thus cast a deep stain upon the Christian profession which time will never efface. But you who claim *more* than a *name* to Christianity have a duty to perform. Remember that *your* property must contribute to defray the large expenditure* for the support of this war, in which a nation of upwards of *three hundred millions* of people, who have been at peace for ages, are now to be attacked and murdered by *Christian* Britain, because they endeavoured, in the most legitimate manner, to enforce their laws against Englishmen, who persisted in illegally introducing the most deadly poison into *their country*, by which the lives of tens of thousands of their people were annually destroyed.†

* ‘It is well known that double pay has been given to some parties engaged in hastening and accompanying the armament to China, and that at our arsenals even the Sabbath has been employed to expedite the completion of the required instruments of destruction; and besides the addition to our taxation for the increase of the army and navy, the price of tea has advanced more than 1s. 3d. per lb., which, on the annual consumption of the kingdom, amounts to upwards of two and a half millions sterling, chiefly paid by the working classes.’

† ‘The advocates of this war urge as a justification the conduct of the Chinese, to which they were driven by our violation of their laws; but every candid man will acknowledge the absurdity of this plea, even if their alleged facts were proved.’

'A wholesale carnage, which it is frightful to contemplate, has already begun,* and surely the disciples of the Prince of Peace cannot be held guiltless if they are silent on this occasion. Is it not the duty of everyone, of whatever religious denomination, solemnly to protest against such a war as this, although not prepared with me to condemn all war as forbidden under the Christian dispensation? and if our legislators treat their remonstrances with contempt or indifference, the people of China may hereafter learn that it was not the disciples of Him whose doctrines the missionaries have preached who were engaged in their destruction, but a party in power who, though *professing* the name, *possessed* not the spirit of Christianity.

'May the blessing of the Most High rest upon your efforts in opposing this iniquitous war, but should He in His inscrutable wisdom permit it to proceed, and should the blood of murdered nations hereafter be visited upon us in just retribution, may you possess the consoling reflection that these crimes and calamities of your country were evils you could not avert.

'I am, very respectfully,

'JOSEPH STURGE.

'Birmingham : 3rd month, 19th, 1840.'

Through his exertions, also, a large meeting was held at Freemasons' Hall, at which Earl Stanhope presided, when, in spite of a formidable and seemingly organised opposition, strong resolutions, condemnatory of the war, were carried. Unhappily, as is too often the case in this country, the China war, instead of being tried on its own merits and by the eternal principles of truth and morality, was converted into a battle-field for a great party fight, during which the question as to

* Several of the Chinese junks have been sunk by the cannon of the British ships, and about nine hundred of their people are said to have been either killed or drowned on this occasion.

the justice of our cause and the true honour of our country was subordinated to what, in the eyes of party politicians, was far more important, whether the Whigs or the Tories should enjoy the power and emolument of office.

The opium trade with China, which was the immediate occasion of this war, always lay as a heavy burden on the mind of Mr. Sturge. The spectacle of a Christian nation, purely for its own profit, forcing upon a heathen country, in defiance of its laws and against the earnest remonstrances of its Government, a pernicious and poisonous drug, which not only ruined the health but blighted the morals of the people to an appalling extent, was unspeakably distressing to him. Again and again did he lift up his voice in indignant protest against a policy so nefarious and dishonourable. Indeed some of the most strenuous efforts he made during the latter years of his life were directed to the revival of the Anti-Opium Society, in the hope that through its agency the public conscience might be roused to a sense of this great commercial iniquity. But the unscrupulous cupidity of trade has hitherto proved too strong for philanthropy and religion.

CHAPTER XIV.

THE SUFFRAGE MOVEMENT.

State of the Country twenty Years ago — Great Depression and Suffering — Bad Feeling between the Middle and Working Classes — The latter in the hands of bad Advisers — Physical Force Chartists — Riots in the Manufacturing Districts — Panic and Prejudice of the Middle Classes — Mr. Sturge's deep Sorrow at this condition of things — The 'Nonconformist' Newspaper — Mr. Sturge's Qualifications to lead the Suffrage Movement — Letters from Mr. Cobden and Lord Brougham — His first Public Step in the Cause — Early Success of the Movement — Conference of Delegates at Birmingham — The Result — Mr. S. Crawford's Motion in Parliament — Nottingham Election — Mr. Sturge becomes a Candidate — His Speech at the Nomination — Mr. Walter is returned, but unseated on Petition — Extracts from Miss Sturge's Letters — Union of the Middle and Working Classes during the Election — Further Progress of the Suffrage Movement — Obstacles in the Way — Feargus O'Connor — His Character and Influence with the Working Classes — Another Conference at Birmingham — Mr. Sturge's Speech — Violent Debates — The two Parties fail to agree, and separate.

WE are now coming to a portion of Mr. Sturge's life which at the time exposed him to a great deal of misconstruction and obloquy, and in respect to which there probably still exists considerable difference of opinion even among those who are equally his friends and admirers. We have already seen how distinct was his conviction that a Christian is not at liberty, on the plea of guarding his own piety from worldly taint, to evade the duties of citizenship. But to appreciate aright the active part he took in promoting that movement in favour of enlarging the suffrage, of which we are now

to speak, it is necessary that we should try to understand what were the social and political circumstances of the country twenty years ago.

It has been previously remarked that the pertinacity with which both the great political parties turned a deaf ear to the cry of the nation, often rising into a piercing wail of distress, for the repeal of those protective laws which were operating so disastrously on the commerce of the country and on the well-being of the masses, had obliged Mr. Sturge to look to an improved representation of the people as the only effectual means of obtaining the redress which had been so long demanded in vain from parliament as then constituted. In the letter previously referred to, which he wrote to Mr. Cobden on his return from America in 1841, he had said :—

‘I have been driven to the conclusion, that it is not only hopeless to expect justice for the labouring population from the representatives of the present constituencies, but that the infatuated policy which now guides our rulers will be persisted in until they plunge millions into want and misery, if not bring them into a premature grave. I, therefore, think the time is arrived when every friend of humanity, of whatever class, sect, or party, should endeavour to obtain and secure for the people a just and permanent control over their own affairs.’

This may appear to us now to be strong language, but it was not stronger than was warranted by the state of things which prevailed at the time when it was written. Hundreds of thousands of the people already *were* ‘plunged into want and misery.’ ‘The distress had now so deepened,’ says Miss Martineau, referring to this period, ‘in the manufacturing districts as to render it clearly inevitable that many must die, and a

multitude be lowered to a state of sickness and irritability from want of food; while there seemed no chance of any member of the manufacturing classes coming out of the struggle at last with a vestige of property wherewith to begin the world again.*

We need not wonder, therefore, that men should turn away in despair from a House of Commons which, in the face of all this, clung with desperate tenacity to laws that were so largely contributing to produce this wide-spread misery and ruin. We shall, however, do Mr. Sturge and his associates in the suffrage movement great injustice if we imagine that their agitation had no broader principle for its foundation than a mere desire to effect a diversion in favour of the League. We must seek deeper than this for the motives by which they were actuated.

When the demand arose for parliamentary reform at the beginning of the reign of William IV., all classes—save only the class which up to that time had enjoyed all but a monopoly of political power—had joined in the agitation with a unanimity and enthusiasm rarely paralleled. No one doubts that the earnestness with which the working men throughout the country threw themselves into the movement had contributed greatly to the popular victory. They saw clearly enough that, under the provisions of the particular measure then proposed, they were almost wholly excluded from any share in the franchise. But they generously consented to postpone their own claims, confiding in the assurances of which the middle classes were then sufficiently lavish, that when they were admitted within the pale of the constitution they would take care to use their power

* *History of the Thirty Years' Peace*, vol. ii. p. 590.

to open the door for their countrymen who were yet left without. It was, however, soon discovered that after they had once gained possession of their own political rights, they concerned themselves but little for those who were still deprived of them. The working classes, therefore, became greatly embittered against the middle classes, as men are apt to be who deem themselves not only defrauded but duped. After having long waited in vain for some sign of practical sympathy from their former allies, they commenced an agitation on their own behalf, and embodied their demands in the document known by the name of 'The People's Charter.'

Such a misunderstanding between two sections of the community, who were connected together in so many important relations, was a serious misfortune. But between the years 1838 and 1842 circumstances arose, altogether apart from the original cause, which tended greatly to aggravate this alienation. There came a long period of severe commercial and industrial distress. A succession of bad harvests, combined with the operation of the corn laws, had raised articles of food to almost famine price. Throughout the manufacturing districts, there was such general stagnation of trade as reduced multitudes of the people to a state bordering on starvation. It was, surely, a very pardonable mistake if those who were suffering so severely, and whose education had been but very imperfectly cared for, were disposed to attach an exaggerated value to the possession of the franchise as a means of relieving their social distresses, the more especially as they could then very distinctly trace a large portion of their sufferings to bad legislation. Unhappily, also, the working classes fell into the hands of bad advisers, who, taking advantage

of their ignorance and credulity, laboured hard to breed bad blood between them and their employers, while at the same time they whispered in their ears that the only way to attain their rights and to avenge their wrongs was by the strong hand of violence. It must be pleaded, in extenuation of the readiness with which the people yielded to these sinister counsels, that most of the instruction they had ever derived from the example of their rulers was such as tended to glorify physical force in their estimation as the only guardian and vindicator of justice. Is it any wonder that those who have been taught by their own governments to regard the triumphs of the sword with unbounded worship as the principal glory of nations, should be sometimes tempted to ask, whether they could not turn the same instrumentality to account on their own behalf? Thus, predisposed by the whole tenour of opinion in the midst of which they had been brought up in favour of violence as a means both of redress and renown, the less intelligent of the working-classes unhappily gave too much heed to itinerant agitators who took advantage of their sufferings to 'pour into their ears the lep'rous distilment' of physical-force doctrines, by which, in many instances, they were incited to tumultuous and menacing demonstrations. Among the coal districts of Wales, among the nailers and miners of Dudley and Stourbridge, in the potteries of Staffordshire, as well as in the manufacturing towns of Lancashire and Yorkshire, there were riotous mobs who committed considerable depredations on property and spread great alarm through the country. These disorders, shared in by only a very small proportion of the distressed operatives, had filled the minds of many of the propertied and commercial classes with that kind of panic terror which so easily

glides into injustice, and had begotten in their hearts such bitter prejudices against the less favoured of their fellow-countrymen, as led them to repel with anger and insolence all their claims to equality of political privilege. In a letter to Mr. Lewis Tappan, Mr. Sturge says :—

‘ Our unenfranchised countrymen are *politically* much in the same position as your slaves, and in many of the electors there is nearly as strong a feeling against giving them the franchise as there is against giving it to the slave with you.’

*answer
to
O. W. B.*

This, certainly, was hardly an exaggeration of the feeling which widely prevailed, and to which expression was given in no measured terms by many of the journals of the day. The knowledge that such a feeling did prevail, reacted again most unhappily on the great masses of the people. Their hearts became hot with indignation. To avenge themselves of the wrong and insult inflicted on their class, there was the greatest danger of their throwing themselves more than ever into the arms of men who would gladly have used the opportunity to inspire them with hostility not only to the institutions of the country, but to the Christian faith itself, for there is no such efficient auxiliary to the infidel as a system of social and political injustice perpetuated under the apparent sanction of the Gospel.*

* It was at this same period that the late Dr. Arnold, under a deep sense of the social injustice which lay at the root of these disturbances, thus writes :—‘ It haunts me I might almost say night and day. It fills me with astonishment to see Anti-slavery and missionary Societies &c. busy with the ends of the earth, and yet all the worst evils of slavery and heathenism are existing among ourselves. But no man seems so gifted, or, to speak more properly, so endowed of God with the spirit of wisdom as to read this fearful riddle truly ; which, most Sphinx-like, if not read truly, will most surely be the destruction of us all.

‘ My fear with regard to every remedy that involves any sacrifice to the

Mr. Sturge watched all this with the deepest sorrow and anxiety: He looked, of course, with unqualified abhorrence upon the attempts that were being made to seduce the industrious classes into asserting their political rights by an appeal to force. But his sense of justice no less revolted against the contemptuous tone in which many of the privileged sections of the community were wont to speak of them, and to deny them the possession of any rights at all. He thought it would be doing good service to both classes, if, by weaning the former from the dangerous theories which inspired so much distrust and dislike of their cause, he could induce the latter to listen in a more generous temper to the claims of so large a body of their fellow-countrymen. While he and others were anxiously reflecting on these things, an unexpected and very efficient auxiliary came to their aid. In the year 1841 the 'Nonconformist' newspaper was established, and immediately began to publish a series of masterly articles, in which, under the general title of 'Reconciliation between the Middle and Labouring Classes,' the thoughts

upper classes is, that the public mind is not yet enough aware of the magnitude of the evil to submit to them. "Knowest thou not yet that Egypt is destroyed?" was the question put to Pharaoh by his councillors; for unless he did know it they were aware he would not let Israel go from serving him.'

Writing to Mr. Justice Coleridge on Chartism—"I would give anything to be able to arrange a society for drawing public attention to the state of the labouring classes throughout the kingdom.

'It seems to me that people are not enough aware of the monstrous state of society, absolutely without a parallel in the history of the world—with a population poor, miserable and degraded in body and mind, as much as if they were slaves; and yet called freemen, and having a power as such of concerting and combining plans of risings which make them ten times more dangerous than slaves, and the hopes entertained by many of the effects to be wrought by new churches and schools while the social evils of their condition are left uncanceled—appear to me to be utterly wild.'—*Life of Arnold*, 2nd edition, 1844, pp. 133, 107, 178.

that had been vaguely revolving in many minds on this subject were embodied and expressed with singular clearness and power. Mr. Sturge hailed with great satisfaction the appearance in the field of politics of a writer who, combining a high tone of Christian sentiment with earnest sympathy with the people, was able to interpret what had long been his own views and wishes with a force of reasoning and a felicity of style to which he could make no pretensions. The articles referred to were republished in the form of a pamphlet, with a brief introduction from the pen of Mr. Sturge, and had an immense circulation among both sections of the community to whom they were addressed. In the few words which he prefixed to this publication, Mr. Sturge thus explains his own reasons for embarking in the agitation :—

‘The Editor of the “Nonconformist London Weekly Newspaper,” in which the following articles recently appeared, has given a general permission to reprint them. The principles are so ably stated, and the conclusions drawn from them are in themselves so just and equitable, that, without committing myself to the details, I earnestly commend them to the candid and impartial consideration of those who wish to be guided in their political as well as religious conduct by the precepts of the Gospel.

‘It is a distinguishing and beautiful feature of Christianity, that it leads us to recognise every country as *our* country, and every man as *our* brother; and as there is no moral degradation so awful, no physical misery so great, as that inflicted by personal slavery, I have felt it my duty to labour for its universal extinction.

‘Whilst thus engaged, it has sometimes been pressed upon me that the sufferings of my fellow-countrymen had a prior claim on my attention; and I freely acknowledge that the Patriot and the Christian fail in the discharge of their duty,

*C. Hill
at
Cam.*

if they do not, by all peaceable and legitimate means, strive to remove the enormous evil of class legislation.

'I would therefore solemnly appeal to all, to consider if they may not, by timely exertion, avert yet greater calamities, and seriously to ask themselves whether they have not an individual responsibility which, if they remain indifferent spectators, will include them in the condemnation of him "who knoweth to do good, and doeth it not," for "to him it is sin."

'JOSEPH STURGE.'

It will become apparent enough as we proceed, that he entered upon this work under a solemn sense of responsibility. Nor can it be doubted that he was held by many to be in some respects singularly qualified for taking the lead in such an attempt to effect reconciliation between the middle and working classes. Mr. Cobden, though he would have preferred that his friend's energies had been directed to the same object from which he firmly refused himself to be drawn aside to any other agitation whatever, yet acknowledged that if any one could succeed in the end he had undertaken, it was Joseph Sturge. Speaking of the Declaration on the Suffrage to be signed by 'men out of doors,' that is not in Parliament, he says, in a letter dated Nov. 21, 1841:—

'In such case *your* name is the very best in all England to head the list. I say this without compliment, or even views of doing you justice, but simply with an eye to policy. You have so much of established reputation to fall back upon that your standing with the middle class would not be endangered by a course which might peril the character and endanger the usefulness of most others. You would carry with you the philanthropists and the religious world, or at least neutralise their opposition, and without their aid no *moral* victory can be achieved in this age and country.'

The known benevolence of his life, and the stainless purity of his motives, contributed, moreover, to win recognition and respect for any movement with which he was associated from many who could not fully adopt his political programme. Thus, Lord Brougham says, writing to him in reference to a petition which at his request he had presented to the House of Lords—and the letter is further valuable for its generous tribute to the character of the working classes—

‘Grafton Street: May 5, 1842.

‘DEAR JOSEPH STURGE,—In presenting the Union Petition, I told the particulars of the Birmingham Meeting, and expressed my hope that those who could not agree in its prayer, and differed even more widely than I did from the opinions set forth, would, at least, receive it with the respect due to the vast number of worthy and useful men holding the same opinions with the petitioners.

‘I am quite certain that in expressing my deep sense of the merits of the working classes, both in parliament and at the late meeting on the Birckbeck testimonial, I rather underrated than exaggerated them. No one who has so long known the working classes can entertain a doubt of their honest and peaceable disposition. Truly it is to them that the prosperity of the country is mainly owing, and unhappily, when evil times come, the pressure must always fall heaviest upon them. Yet we see them generally submitting to their hard lot with a patience and even cheerfulness which can never be sufficiently admired. Surely nothing can give them a greater claim on our confidence; and though men may differ as to the steps by which, and the time at which, those classes should be admitted within the pale of the constitution, yet all must agree in looking forward to this consummation as the object which reformers should keep steadily in view.—Believe me,

‘Truly yours,

‘H. BROUGHAM.’

The first public step taken by Mr. Sturge to give

effect to his views was at a meeting of Anti-Corn-Law deputies, assembled at Manchester on Wednesday, November 17, 1841. At the close of the business for which the meeting was specially convened, he invited any of the deputies who might feel an interest in the question of organic reform to a separate conference on that subject before they left the town.

‘It was a strong proof of sympathy with the people,’ says Mr. Prentice, ‘and of respect for Mr. Sturge, that the meeting was attended by nearly all the deputies who had been present till the conclusion of the delegate meeting. . . . Mr. Sturge stated his strong conviction of the necessity of a radical reform . . . and that there were no other effectual means to secure the country from the mischiefs of class legislation. A conversation ensued, in which it was apparent that there was a great desire to promote a movement of thorough reform, provided it could be kept distinct from the operations of the League.’

Ultimately a resolution was passed requesting Joseph Sturge and W. Sharman Crawford, M.P., to draw up a general declaration, which, if approved, might be signed by the deputies, and then published, accompanied with an invitation for the signature of other friends of reform. About the middle of December the following declaration was accordingly put forth :—

Sturge's declaration
‘Deeply impressed with the conviction of the evils arising from class legislation, and of the sufferings thereby inflicted upon our industrious fellow-subjects, the undersigned affirm that a large majority of the people of this country are unjustly excluded from that fair, full, and free exercise of the elective franchise to which they are entitled by the great principle of Christian equity, and also by the British Constitution; for “no subject of England can be constrained to pay any aids or taxes, even for the defence of the realm or the

support of the government, but such as are imposed by his own consent or that of his representative in parliament.”—See Blackstone's *Commentaries*, vol. i. book i. chap. 1.

The conjuncture seemed favourable to the movement. Many of those who had been deeply interested in the question of commercial freedom, without having paid much heed to that of the suffrage, seeing how resolutely parliament turned aside their claim as respects the former, were driven in despair to look to the latter as the only alternative means of redress. At a convention of Anti-Corn-Law delegates at Edinburgh, at a banquet at Glasgow, and at the great Anti-Corn-Law Conference in London—all of them held at the beginning of 1842—ample opportunity was afforded of bringing the matter under the notice of a large number of the picked men of the middle classes. The two objects were never, indeed, mixed up together. The League, having been formed for a specific purpose in respect to which all the members were agreed, wisely declined to intermeddle, as a body, with any other subject. Nor was Mr. Sturge less anxious to keep his own movement distinct from theirs. ‘The mildness of his manners,’ says Mr. Miall, ‘the simplicity of his speech his evident sincerity of purpose and benevolence of soul, added weight to the justice and reasonableness of the truths he propounded.’

The declaration was received with great favour. Signatures from electors and non-electors flowed in by thousands from various parts of the country, and it was thought no time should be lost in embodying the sentiment thus so generally evoked in some form of practical policy and organisation. Mr. Sturge, as was his wont, began at Birmingham. A provisional committee was formed there at the beginning of 1842 to initiate the

movement. They entered into correspondence with the friends of reform in all parts of the country, and having collected a large body of opinion favourable to the principle of the declaration, on February 25 a meeting of the nature of a conference was called at the Waterloo Rooms, to submit to the inhabitants of the town the information that had been thus gathered, and to ascertain their views on the subject. At the hour appointed for commencing the proceedings, the large room, we are told, 'was filled by manufacturers, tradespeople and working men.' After some discussion the meeting determined to appoint canvassers to solicit signatures to a memorial to the Queen founded after the declaration in favour of complete suffrage. In less than a month the canvassers could report that upwards of 16,000 of their fellow-townsmen, including about 2,000 electors, had affixed their names to the document. On March 21, a public meeting was held at the town hall to report the result, and to appoint delegates to attend a general conference which it was now determined should be held on the following April. On the 5th of that month accordingly, eighty-seven delegates from different parts of England, Scotland, and Ireland, met at Birmingham. Great care had been taken in the arrangements made for the appointment of delegates; both that they should have a genuine representative character, and that they should consist, as nearly as possible, in equal proportions of middle-class and working-class men. Many fears were entertained by those who convened the meeting as to how far these two elements could be brought to combine. For, as we have already attempted to explain, mutual prejudice and jealousy had grown fierce between them. We cannot better describe the result than by borrowing a

few sentences from an article which soon after appeared in the 'Eclectic Review,' and which, as is now no secret, was from the pen of Mr. Edward Miall:—

'The sessions of the body lasted four days, the discussions occupying about nine hours each day. The forms observed were regular, and adhered to with the utmost strictness. A deep tone of earnestness ran through all the debates. The errors of the past were freely adverted to on both sides, and occasionally self-vindication compelled the speakers to tread on tender ground; yet not once during the whole time did interruption occur, or disapprobation find vent in rude clamour. As the several stages of interval between the two sections were safely passed, interest became more feverish; and when the last topic of difference, the discussion of which lasted the whole of the third day, was under debate, excitement verged on irritability. . . . But the last ground of dispute was now cast away. Joy gleamed in every eye, and in some glittered behind tears. The resolution was put to the meeting. Every hand was held up in its favour, and now emotion would have vent. A shout of triumph shook the walls of the room. Delegates of both classes grasped each other by the hand, and mutually congratulated each other upon their happy escape from the menaced danger.'

We greatly fear that all this appearance of earnestness in the discussion of political questions will seem ludicrous enough to the advanced intelligence and philosophy of our age. We have learnt to deal with all such matters in another temper, that of genteel indifference or cynical disdain.

Ultimately it was resolved—

'That an association be now formed, to be entitled "The National Complete Suffrage Union," and that the following be its object: 1. The creating and extending an enlightened public opinion in favour of the principle and necessary details of complete suffrage, viz. the extension of the elective fran-

chise to every man twenty-one years of age, who has not been deprived of his citizenship in consequence of a verdict of his countrymen; the abolition of the property qualification for members of parliament; the adoption of voting by ballot; the dividing the country into equal electoral districts; the payment of all the legal election expenses, and a reasonable remuneration to members of parliament; and that annual parliaments are a proper means for securing responsibility of members to their constituents.'

For some time after this meeting, those who were trying to promote reconciliation between the middle and working classes were sanguine in their hopes of success. From many parts of the kingdom adhesions were received to the platform adopted at Birmingham. A considerable number of the more intelligent and moderate of the Chartists cordially accepted the overtures for union made to them. A motion embodying all the points enumerated above as the basis of the association, and pledging the House 'on an early day to resolve itself into a committee of the whole House for the purpose of considering the same,' was submitted to the House of Commons by Mr. Sharman Crawford, and supported by seventy-four votes.

Just at the critical time, too, an opportunity offered itself to test the popularity of the movement by an appeal to a constituency in which the two elements proposed to be united existed in larger measure than in almost any constituency in the kingdom. The town of Nottingham had, within the last few years, acquired great notoriety by its electoral contests. At the election of April 1841, Mr. Walter, the proprietor of the 'Times,' had defeated the Whig candidate. But when the Whigs appealed to the country in support of their commercial measures, in July of the same year, this decision was reversed. Mr. Walter was defeated and

Sir J. C. Hobhouse and Sir G. Larpent returned. A petition, however, was presented against their return on the ground of corruption and bribery. It was no secret that at both elections corrupt means had been employed in the most shameless manner, and to an enormous extent. While the inquiry which ensued on the presentation of the petition was pending, the friends of freedom and purity of election, anticipating that the return of the successful candidates would be declared void, had already turned their attention to Joseph Sturge as the best man to lead their forlorn hope against both Whigs and Tories. But while they were in correspondence with him, intelligence reached Nottingham that the parties in London, fearing the inevitable exposures consequent on an inquiry, had entered into a compromise; Sir G. Larpent had accepted the Chiltern Hundreds, and it was agreed that Mr. Walter should walk over the course. These tidings excited great indignation among that portion of the inhabitants not committed to the policy of the two great parties who thus, for their own convenience, were making the borough a matter of sale and barter. This circumstance, combined with the high state of feeling already existing, created intense excitement in the town. A meeting was immediately called, and a requisition to Joseph Sturge to stand as a candidate at the coming election was adopted, and before the day was over, had been signed by between seven and eight hundred electors. In reply, Mr. Sturge accepted the nomination on the following rather unusual 'conditions:—'That no money be spent, or any improper influence used to bias a single vote in my favour; and that in the event of my return to parliament, if I find from experience that I could not conscientiously retain my

seat, or that I could be more serviceable to my country by resigning it, I should be at liberty to do so.' On May 18, he visited the town, and was received by a large concourse of people who had assembled to do him honour on his entry. He addressed an immense public meeting in the market-place in explanation of his principles, and after declaring himself opposed to Church establishments and military establishments, and the Corn and Provision laws, and in favour of an extension of the suffrage to every man of twenty-one years of age, unless disqualified by a verdict of a jury of his countrymen, he added, that while feeling it his duty to assert the social and political rights of his fellow-countrymen, he should 'deem it still incumbent on him especially to advocate the cause of those who are held in personal slavery in any part of the world, in accordance with the dictates of our holy religion, which teaches us that every country is our country, and every man our brother.' 'He would not,' he said, 'pay one sixpence towards securing his election. He said this as a matter of conscience, and he would also say, though not out of disrespect to the electors, that he would not ask for a vote, even if it would turn the election in his favour.'

His opponent, Mr. Walter, also soon appeared on the scene, and endeavoured to excite prejudice against Mr. Sturge, by describing him as 'the advocate of two principles, the charter and teetotalism.' It may, indeed, be regarded as a very singular tribute to the high personal character of Mr. Sturge, that in a contest conducted on such principles as he avowed—a contest in which there were no banners or processions, or open public-houses, or personal canvass, or pecuniary expenditure of any kind—the popular element nevertheless

rallied around him with extraordinary enthusiasm. As a specimen of his political oratory, perhaps it may be well to cite here a portion of the speech he delivered on the day of his nomination. After avowing and defending the various points for which he contended in his Complete Suffrage Association, he thus concluded :—

‘ But you are told that I will not make any pecuniary sacrifices for you. It is true I told you I would not give you sixpence for your votes, and I repeat it. If I am worth anything, I am worth the trouble of sending me free of expense, subject to this declaration, that if you return me, the moment a majority of the people wish me to resign my seat, I will do it. From this, do not understand that I will not go to the poll. As I have already stated, if only six honest men wish to record their votes for me, they shall have an opportunity of doing so. Whilst I abhor bribery, and whilst I would warn you to beware of the briber, I consider the rich man who offers the bribe to be a greater criminal than the poor man who accepts it. I am glad that we have to fight this great battle first in Nottingham, and that our opponent is the leviathan of the public press. First, because in Nottingham, though it is renowned for its contests in favour of liberty, yet, from the revolting disclosures which have lately taken place, it is evident all that a profuse expenditure by both the political parties could accomplish has been done to corrupt the constituents; and secondly, because I wish the strength of our principles to be contested with one who wields a power, in comparison with which that of the greatest potentate on earth dwindles into insignificance. It was said by Sheridan, in the House of Commons, at a time when Napoleon was in the plenitude of his power, “ Bonaparte may withstand all the artillery of the enemy in front of his army, but he cannot withstand the silent but more powerful artillery of the pen.” He afterwards went on to describe, with that eloquence for which he was so celebrated, the fall of the liberties of a people

one by one before the power of despotism, and then exclaimed, "But leave me only the liberty of the press. With this mighty engine I would destroy the fabric of corruption, and build on its ruins the rights and privileges of the people." But (said Mr. S. with great good humour, and pointing to Mr. Walter), "how are the mighty fallen!" Sheridan perhaps little thought that the day would come when the London newspaper press would become so venal that with a little exception—and three of those exceptions I will mention, the "Morning Advertiser," the "Nonconformist," and the "British Statesman"—the people look in vain for an uncompromising and an unpaid advocacy through its channels. And what has been the consequence? Why, that this press has so justly lost the confidence of the people, that he who controls the most powerful engine in the world is now carrying on a contest, with not very sanguine hopes of success, with an individual without political or family influence, and whom he called in derision, through the columns of the "Times," but a few months ago, "the Birmingham Quaker Chartist." If our principles should triumph here, with such fearful odds against them, it may, indeed, animate with lively hope every constituency in the kingdom. But, whatever may be the result of to-morrow's poll, I can assure our opponents that I will use any influence I possess to prevent the slightest act of violence or incivility on the part of those who wish to promote my election; and I wish also to assure my friends, that I would rather our rivals succeeded by an overwhelming majority, than that the victory to our cause was obtained by a single act that could tarnish its lustre. I hope we may look to our opponents heartily to co-operate with us in the promotion of peace and good order. It is a beautiful feature in Christian principle, and a stamp of its divine authority, that when it is carried into practice it promotes the happiness of all classes; and should these principles have an ascendancy in our legislature, I feel persuaded that this empire might yet be the most prosperous upon earth. The defiance of all law and order, and of all social and political morality, which has been exposed in the conduct of the professed representatives of the people, has disgraced our

country in the eyes of the civilised world ; but I confidently hope that, before to-morrow's sun has attained its meridian height, Nottingham will have raised a standard, with peace, law, and order inscribed upon it, round which the friends of purity of election and human liberty will rally with rapidly increasing strength, until, with resistless power, they shall sweep away the enormous evils of class legislation, and raise in their stead a temple of imperishable materials, dedicated to a full, fair, and free representation of the people.

After a very severe contest Mr. Walter was returned, the numbers being :—

Walter	1,885
Sturge	1,801
						<hr/>
Majority for Walter	84

An election committee, however, unseated Mr. Walter. The seat was offered to Mr. Sturge, on his petition, but he declined to take that step. He was again invited to stand, but declined that also. But Mr. Gisborne, who contested the borough on the principles of complete suffrage against Mr. Walter, jun., was returned by a considerable majority.

Miss Sturge had, at his own request, accompanied her brother to Nottingham, and from her letters we have a pleasant glimpse behind the scenes—into her and his alternation and conflict of feeling, amid circumstances to them so unusual : ‘To a friend less interested than thou art,’ she says in one of her letters, ‘in everything pertaining to us, I should find it difficult to explain why Joseph wished me to accompany him. It arose from that feeling which is stronger in him than in many weaker men, of leaning on affection in moments of trial and perplexity.’ And after the election was over, she writes, under date of 8th Mo. 16, 1842 :—

‘As for Nottingham, I think Joseph has felt it—I am sure I have—an unlooked-for victory. I do not mean that it did not at one time appear likely for him to have been the successful candidate; but I dared not anticipate that the whole affair would have been so satisfactory—so truly, notwithstanding the annoyance of Feargus O’Connor, what an election should be. Thou hast read Joseph’s speech at the nomination; several who were present speak of his manner and delivery in terms of warm commendation. Badly as he often expresses himself on common occasions, under the influence of deep feeling he becomes almost eloquent. . . . I see the danger of his situation, and have often been visited with doubts whether he ought to be thus engaged; but when I have been almost arriving at the conclusion that he should withdraw, some striking exhibition of the power with which he is enabled to meet one or another trying exigency, gives such evidence of the preserving tender care of his gracious Master, that, knowing as I do his sincere desire to follow His guidance, I cannot believe that he is, or will be, left to the dictates of his own erring will.’

The most gratifying circumstance connected with this election, was the perfect cordiality with which electors and non-electors at Nottingham combined for his support. Mr. Feargus O’Connor, Mr. Henry Vincent, and other popular leaders of the Chartist body visited the town as the strenuous upholders of Mr. Sturge’s candidateship. He and those associated with him in the suffrage movement accepted these facts as full of favourable augury for the union between the middle and working classes which they were labouring to effect. For a time there were many other propitious appearances. The infamous practices brought to light by Mr. Roebuck’s ‘Elections’ Compromise Committee, already referred to, impressed many minds with the necessity of some change to save the country from

festering into a mass of political corruption. Many of the liberal provincial journals ably espoused the movement inaugurated by Mr. Sturge. Auxiliary associations were being rapidly formed in most of the large and many of the smaller towns throughout the country. But just at that time there came a serious check:—

‘Driven to desperation by their sufferings, and left in neglect by the government and legislature, the operatives broke out into wide-spread insurrection, and our mining and manufacturing districts became the scene of a strike unprecedented in its extent, singularly mild in its prevailing characteristics, originally directed almost exclusively to an increase of wages, but artfully fomented and turned to political account by the old Chartist leaders. The authorities took the alarm; the middle classes were turned out as special constables; the police forces were strengthened; the military were despatched to the scene of disorder; collision ensued in several towns—loss of life, exasperation of feeling; the old sore, not yet healed, broke out afresh; and the prospects of the complete suffrage movement were again overshadowed by a dark cloud.’*

This was a time of great trial for Mr. Sturge and his colleagues. But they did not shrink from their post. They issued two addresses—one to the enfranchised classes, entreating them to give expression to a kindly sympathy for their less favoured countrymen at that critical moment, as the best means of calming them down into patience—the other to the unenfranchised classes, promising them new exertions for the recovery of their rights, and entreating them to resign all hopeless contests, and to trust to peaceful efforts and moral means alone.

There were other obstructions, also, of a different

* *The Rise and Progress of the Complete Suffrage Movement*, p. 19.

nature to that fusion of classes which Mr. Sturge so much desired, arising from the selfish personal ambition of certain self-constituted leaders of the working-classes. The most conspicuous of these was Feargus O'Connor. He was an Irishman by birth, and boasted of being descended from the ancient kings of that country. He began his public life as a member of what was called Mr. O'Connell's tail, devoting himself for a while with great ardour and energy to the person and cause of the great agitator. In that interest he was returned to parliament, in 1833, for the county of Cork. But his aspiring and turbulent disposition did not permit him to remain long in the ranks of any party. He attempted to share the leadership of the Irish people with his chief. But Mr. O'Connell, who never could 'bear a brother near the throne,' and whose influence in Ireland was at that time unbounded, very easily extinguished his mutinous lieutenant so far as he possessed any influence among his countrymen. Driven thus from the field of Irish agitation, he transferred his services to the working-classes of England. Though a man of slender intellect, and utterly devoid of judgment, he possessed some qualities which well fitted him for the character of a demagogue. He was a man of almost gigantic stature, upwards of six feet high, and brawny and broad-chested in proportion. When his oratory was unavailing, he could, and did on occasion, fling himself into the thick of an excited crowd, and by his pugilistic prowess make an impression on those whom his eloquence had failed to convince. But he had, also, considerable powers as a mob orator. He possessed abundant fluency of speech, and a stentorian strength of lungs which, in the large out-of-door gatherings then common among the working-classes, gave him great

advantage over all competitors, for the roar of his voice would reach the ears of a vast multitude, where the oratory of others would be little better than dumb show. He knew also how to wield with effect a certain coarse facetiousness which tickled the ears of the vulgar, and threw them into uproarious laughter. In addition to all which he indulged habitually in the most fulsome flattery of the common people, affected to call them his 'children,' and to have made great pecuniary and other sacrifices for their behoof. He had, moreover, established a newspaper entitled 'The Northern Star,' which had a very extensive circulation, and which he took every pains to make the organ of the Chartists by reporting their meetings at great length, accompanied with the wildest exaggerations of the numbers present, and the most extravagant eulogies on the eloquence of those who flourished as the oracles of the occasion. By these means O'Connor had acquired immense influence over large bodies of the working-men, especially in the north of England. This influence he was determined to retain against all intruders, and being utterly unscrupulous, never hesitated to hunt down by accusation of secret treason, or dishonesty, or speculation, every leader of the party who showed any signs of independence, or of rebellion against his authority. He was, moreover, the declared advocate of physical force, and though he displayed a considerable share of the discretion which contrives to avoid overt and indictable language, his speeches and writings abounded with those dangerous implications and equivocal bravadoes which served to inflame the passions of ignorant men, and prepare them for any enterprise of violence.

It was not very likely that a man of this character should look with much favour upon the movement at

the head of which Joseph Sturge had placed himself. He accordingly denounced it from the first, described Mr. Sturge as 'a cunning tool of the Anti-Corn-Law League,' and insinuated, as was his wont, that he had private intelligence disclosing the dishonest intentions of the Complete Suffragists.

It is true that, with that audacious inconsistency with which he tried so largely the credulity of his followers, he had gone down to Nottingham during the election, and, not a little to the annoyance of Mr. Sturge, proclaimed himself his devoted partisan, and declared that 'wherever the name of philanthropy and kind-heartedness to his fellow-men were heard, there was Joseph Sturge's name to be heard also.' But when the contest was over, and partly perhaps because of the enthusiasm with which Mr. Sturge had been received by the non-electors during the contests, O'Connor reverted to the old strain of distrust and defiance. He consented, however, to a proposal for holding another conference on a larger scale at Birmingham, with a view to discuss the matters in dispute between the middle and working-classes. Considerable pains had been taken to have this conference fairly constituted. It was arranged that in the choice of delegates, electors, and non-electors should return an equal number, except in cases where both bodies could agree to elect the same persons. On December 27, 1842, the conference, numbering nearly 400 persons, met at the Mechanics' Institution, Birmingham. Mr. Sturge was unanimously elected to preside. In his opening remarks he stated that 'the main endeavours of the Complete Suffrage Union had been directed towards breaking down the prejudices of the electors and middle classes, that they might be induced to grant complete justice to their unenfranchised countrymen.'

‘The success we have already met with,’ he continued, ‘gives us good ground to hope that, by forbearance and argument, we shall do much to remove the alienation which has been so lamentably fostered and increased by the events of the last few years. Having at a former conference adopted all the six points which involve any question of principle in what is called the “the people’s charter,” I had hoped it would at least have removed suspicion towards us from the minds of all upright friends of the people; and while we invite the most vigilant watchfulness of our every movement on the part of our fellow-countrymen, we consider we are entitled to claim credit for honesty of intention until the contrary is proved against us; but we are resolved not to be parties to any steps whatever which involve the slightest violation of our peaceable principles, or go further in offending the prejudices of those at whose hands we seek redress, than is called for by a firm adherence to the claim of full justice for our unenfranchised brethren. Whilst men in power professing Christianity, like Lord John Russell, can be justly accused, as he was by his political rival Sir Robert Peel, of inviting one portion of the community to arm against another; while both these high parties bribe our young men to engage in a murderous crusade against the unoffending inhabitants of China and India, and pay them for it with money which is taken out of the pockets of the people; whilst the leading political journals vie with each other in scurrility and falsehood—I cannot wonder that some in a different sphere are found to follow so bad an example. But such conduct is not Christianity. That pure religion teaches us not only “to do unto others as we wish they should do unto us,” but also “to return good for evil;” and we must not expect to obtain the Divine blessing on evil means even in a righteous cause. I wish therefore emphatically to assure this assembly, and I am persuaded I speak the sentiments of every member of the Complete Suffrage Council, that we cannot knowingly act in unison with any who recommend or countenance violence for the attainment of their object; or who, instead of cordially uniting with all honest

men to obtain the rights of the people, waste their time in abusing those who do not exactly tread in their steps. At the same time I trust that when any who have thus acted prove by future deeds as well as words that they have seen their error, the past will be for ever buried in oblivion.'

For a time there was considerable promise of harmony. There were professions of moderation and good temper on all sides. But when the Conference came to consider the question as to what should be taken as the basis of their discussions, there arose a strong divergence of opinion. Properly speaking, indeed, this ought not to have been regarded as an open question. The Conference had been called by the Complete Suffrage Union, and on its own principles, which were by that time sufficiently notorious. Those, therefore, who were not prepared to accept those principles as the point of departure had no business to be there. Mr. Sturge's party accordingly proposed that a bill which had been prepared by the council of the Complete Suffrage Union should be adopted as the basis of deliberation, while Mr. O'Connor's party contended strenuously for the document called 'The People's Charter.' Substantially there was little difference between the two. But Mr. Sturge and his friends contended that the name of the Charter was in such ill odour, owing to the violent language and conduct of some of its advocates in time past, that it was regarded by many of the middle classes as synonymous with tumult and bloodshed. The leaders of the Chartists, on the other hand, maintained that it was the old banner around which the working classes had been accustomed to rally, and that it was endeared to their hearts by the memories, the hopes, and even the sufferings associated with its name. On this ground, therefore, the first battle had to be fought. In the

course of the debate which ensued, the effects of the virus of suspicion and violence infused by O'Connor into the minds of his followers became painfully apparent. Sentiments were avowed and language used which proved clearly enough that, even if they could have agreed on a common political platform, it was not possible that such elements could combine. And when the advocates of the Charter carried their amendment by a large majority, Mr. Sturge's friends felt thankful that this result left him at liberty honourably to withdraw from such uncongenial fellowship. He and the minority which accorded with him retired to another room in the town, where they resumed the discussion of the bill prepared by the Suffrage Union. It cannot be denied that this issue of the Birmingham Conference dealt a heavy blow to Mr. Sturge's project. Not only was the rupture between his party and the extreme Chartists complete and final, but the deliberations of the Conference and its results were held up to triumphant scorn by the Tory and Whig journals as an illustration of the working of universal suffrage. Among his own followers also, all that class, always the most numerous in the wake of every cause, who have no standard of merit but success, and have not enough of the martyr spirit even to bear a laugh, hastily drew away from his side when they found that fidelity to their banner involved some degree of peril and reproach.

CHAPTER XV.

THE SUFFRAGE MOVEMENT—*continued.*

Perseverance of the Leaders—But the Movement languishes—Election at Birmingham—Mr. Sturge's Defeat—Letters from him and his Sister—The Middle Classes absorbed with Free Trade—The Chartist bring Discredit on the Cause by Violence—Mr. Sturge gradually retires from the Movement—But retains his Convictions—His Politics connected with his Christianity—The distinctly Christian Tone he gave to his Advocacy of the Suffrage—Good Effects on the Working Classes—Testimony of Rev. C. Vince and Mr. Henry Vincent—Opposition from Members of his own Society—Letter of Miss Sturge—His own Religious Feelings during the Excitement—Letters to Mr. Tappan—Letters from Mr. Miall—Conversations with his Sister on her Death-bed—His last Appearance in Politics—Education Controversy—Withdraws from the British and Foreign School Society—Election at Leeds.

THE leaders of the movement, however, were resolute men, not disposed lightly to surrender the object they had taken in hand. Mr. Sharman Crawford in the House of Commons, Mr. Edward Miall through the press, and Mr. Sturge in the country, still laboured on loyally in the cause. Mr. Crawford, with a brave temerity which extorted admiration even from his opponents, repeatedly pressed the question of the suffrage on the House of Commons. The agitation was carried on out of doors with considerable animation. Mr. Henry Vincent lent to it the aid of his fervid, popular eloquence, and Mr. Thomas Beggs that of his sound judgment and calm common sense. It began, however, inevitably to languish. The great bulk of the

working classes, with the glamour of delusion still before their eyes, had committed themselves to other guidance. The middle classes, whose patriotism is seldom very adventurous, studious of their own ease and profits, morbidly sensitive to ridicule, and scared by the fear of political disturbances, regarded the question with increasing apathy, the more especially as they saw in the growing strength of the Anti-Corn-Law League the prospect of another speedy remedy for the grievances which pressed most heavily upon themselves.

In the year 1844, another opportunity was afforded to Mr. Sturge of bringing the feelings of his countrymen on this subject to a test. So early as 1840, he had been solicited by a numerous and respectable body of his fellow-townsmen to stand as a candidate for Birmingham. He had so far consented as to issue an address explanatory of his political views. But from an unwillingness to divide the liberal interest, he did not go to the poll, his friends withdrawing his name on the understanding that the whole liberal party would support him at the next vacancy. This occurred in 1844 by the death of Mr. Joshua Scholefield. He was then brought forward again on the invitation of a large town's meeting, attended by several thousands of persons; 'and throughout the contest,' says a pamphlet published at the time, 'as well as at the nomination, the popular feeling was overwhelming in his favour.' His friends, who undertook to canvass the town on his behalf, declared, moreover, that they had received promises of support sufficiently numerous to have placed him at the head of the poll. But electors' promises, like lovers' vows, are proverbially frail. The Whig party, of course, forgot all about their understanding

with him at the previous election, and put forward the son of the late member as their candidate, while the Tories were represented by the respectable name of Mr. Spooner. The result was the return of Mr. Spooner by a considerable majority, only a few hundred votes having been recorded in favour of Mr. Sturge, while upwards of 2,000 voters, or nearly one-third of the electoral body, did not vote at all. In a letter written to his friend Mr. Lewis Tappan, under date of November 30, 1844, Mr. Sturge explains the causes of his defeat. He ascribes it mainly to his espousal of the cause of the unenfranchised, and admits—

‘That the feeling of the electors against giving the franchise to the working classes was becoming more and more strong every year. It is true,’ he adds, ‘there were other causes. Of course the inn-keepers, gin-shop proprietors, and the beer-house keepers were generally against me. The members of the legal profession were also strongly against me, and when it became evident that I could not be returned, a large number of our voters went and voted for the Whig to keep out the Tory, and others, in pique, went and voted for the Tory to keep out the Whig, and a still larger number abstained from voting at all. But still it should be known that one of the great curses of our present system of representation is that it makes the separation wider and wider, as long as it lasts, between those who possess the franchise and those who do not.’

His sister, also, writing to the friend already referred to, thus remarks on the same event:—

‘Well, the election is over, and the few votes recorded for Joseph will doubtless cause it to be esteemed a complete failure. This is humiliating to our poor human nature, but defeat is Joseph’s weapon, and it has ever been made the means of forwarding any righteous cause in which he has been

engaged. No argument could so convincingly prove the fact, as this glaring illustration, of the total want of sympathy between the electors and non-electors. Two immense public meetings were almost unanimous in choosing him, and on the day of nomination the friends of the other candidates could not have been absent, yet it is reported that not more than fifty held up their hands for either. Joseph is, as usual, very calm in the consciousness of having discharged his duty, and well prepared for the abuse that will not fail to be heaped upon him.'

The abuse came in very ample profusion from that section of the liberal press which esteems party of more importance than principle. He was charged with having divided and betrayed the liberal party, together with the other forms of reproach customary on such occasions.

But by whatever explanations he and his friends naturally tried at the time to mitigate the mortification of so utter a defeat, they could not but feel that the issue of the contest was of the nature of an *experimentum crucis*, as respects the complete suffrage movement. If, after three years' incessant agitation in its favour, and at Birmingham, the head-quarters of the Union, with Joseph Sturge—whose great virtues his fellow-townsmen, to do them justice, never ceased to acknowledge and venerate—as its representative and champion, no more than about 350 voters could be found sufficiently in earnest to brave all considerations in support of the principles it affirmed, it was impossible to resist the conviction that its promoters had failed to enlist, to any considerable extent, the sympathies of the middle classes. It lingered on for some time longer, and for several years after this there are frequent allusions to the subject in Mr. Sturge's letters, showing how

anxious was the interest he still felt in the reconciliation of the middle and working classes. Thus, in April 1848, he writes to Mr. Tappan :—

‘ I am sorry to say that I fear the bitter feeling between the higher and a portion of the middle class, and the working classes, is increasing. The former seem determined not to grant their rights to the latter, while some of the latter seem disposed to try physical force for their attainment, and I have great fears that we may not pass through the next twelve months without bloodshed.’

By degrees, however, the manhood suffrage movement which he led faded out of public view. The commercial classes became more and more absorbed in the free trade agitation, which was yearly acquiring greater breadth and force. The leaders of the chartists, no longer restrained or moderated by the influence of their moral force coadjutors, rushed into wilder extremes of fanatic violence. And when the French revolution of 1848 came still further to inflame their excitement, their folly culminated in certain large and tumultuous assemblages held in London, and in the presentation of a monster petition to parliament, professing to bear we know not how many millions of signatures, but a large proportion of which were found, on being scrutinised by a committee of the House, to consist of forged or fictitious names. All this served for a while to bring utter discredit on the whole question of electoral reform. Mr. Sturge continued to the last day of his life faithful to his early convictions on this subject, though advancing age, and perhaps a secret consciousness that he was more fitted by character and taste for the promotion of moral than political reform, led him to decline taking any active part, after this period, in such agitation. In reply to

an invitation to attend a meeting on parliamentary reform at Birmingham, in 1852, he wrote the following letter to the chairman :—

‘ Although I have at a former period of my life devoted no small portion of my time, labour, and money to obtain the rights of my unenfranchised fellow-countrymen, yet I do not see it to be my place to accept the kind invitation I have received to take part in the present movement. I wish, however, to be allowed to state that time and calm reflection have, if possible, strengthened my conviction of the duty and policy of granting to the people that to which they are entitled, alike by the principles of the British constitution and by Christian equity, namely, an equality of political rights, without reference to their being owners or occupiers of any kind of property. Those who withhold these rights from them are, in my opinion, still more criminal in doing so, from the fact that the great body of the working population in this country have long proved by their conduct that they are at least as well qualified for the exercise of their rights as that comparatively small number who now elect our law-makers.

‘ Very respectfully,
‘ JOSEPH STURGE.’

The biographer has no purpose whatever to write of this passage in Mr. Sturge's history in an apologetic tone, as though it were what some have called it, the great error of his life. Far from deeming it an error at all, he regards the part he took in the suffrage agitation as one of the truest and bravest things he ever did. He contends that not only were his motives lofty and pure, which no one acquainted with him could for a moment dispute, but that, with the views he entertained, the course he took was right in itself, imperatively required by that fealty to conscience, which was the underlying principle of his whole existence, and

furnishes one of the finest illustrations we have of his high character as a man and as a Christian. For, strange as it may appear to those who are disposed to look upon all politics as irreligious, and upon all radical politics as infidel, yet nothing is more certain than that what was called the Chartism of Joseph Sturge sprung directly from his Christianity. His struggles for the rights of his unenfranchised countrymen had the same source as his efforts for the liberties of the emancipated negroes. Seeing how distinctly the Gospel recognises the essential dignity and worth of the individual human soul, he could not complacently acquiesce in social and political arrangements which consigned large bodies of his fellow-men to a condition in which they are treated as property, as is the case under slavery, or as mere instruments of labour contributing to the wealth and power of a state, but entitled to no share in the active rights of citizenship, as he believed to be the case under the modern system of representation.

He felt strongly, though he might not have expressed it so happily, the sentiment of the poet, that

‘Our life is turned
Out of her course, wherever man is made—
An offering or a sacrifice; a tool
Or implement; a passive thing employed
As a brute mean, without acknowledgment
Of common right, or interest in the end;
Used or abused as selfishness may prompt.’*

Hence the pertinacity with which he clung to the idea of a *manhood* suffrage, that is, a suffrage in which the right to have a voice in public affairs inhered in the man, and not in any accident of property or social position. He believed profoundly that Christianity itself was compromised and dishonoured by the selfishness which led persons calling themselves Christians rudely

* Wordsworth.

to thrust back millions of upright, laborious, deserving men from all share in political privileges which they themselves highly prized, lest haply their own supremacy or convenience should be brought into any hazard thereby. He was aware, from his familiar intercourse with the working classes, that all this was to a most deplorable extent prejudicing their minds and hardening their hearts against the claims of that blessed religion which was to him dearer than life, and throwing them more and more into the hands of flippant talkers, who were ready, by a cunning use of their political wrongs, to rob them of what has been justly called the last restraint of the powerful and the last hope of the miserable. In illustration of the views entertained by him on this point, we subjoin the following paper of suggestions transmitted in 1842, by his sister, who was his secretary and intimate counsellor in all these matters, to an able friend, who wielded the pen of a ready writer, which was often employed as the interpreter of Mr. Sturge's sentiments and objects to the world :—

‘ Stirling’s excellent essay on the Franchise suggested a wish that the able writer or some other competent to the task would continue the subject, more exclusively bearing on its moral and religious aspects, in a direct appeal to Christians of every class.

‘ To begin by laying the foundation of the present claim to justice on a far wider and stronger basis than the fallacy of an imaginary contract, by asserting the unquestionable truth, that Almighty God is the only source of power—that He only *could* have granted an exclusive charter of privilege, that He has made no difference, that all are alike in His sight, are in the same condition, have the same faculties and responsibilities.

‘ That this equality is the birthright of man, the inalienable

gift of God, proved by the whole tenour of sacred history, and emphatically sealed by the Redeemer of mankind, who gave Himself a ransom for the whole human family.

‘Depict the wide-spread evils of irresponsible power, as it affects whole classes of the community, the temptations to which they are exposed, and the almost inevitable consequence, entire alienation from God.

‘Point out the baneful effects of human degradation, its inseparable vices, and the necessity for man’s elevation, to enable him to understand his duties and appreciate the blessings of the Gospel.

‘Show that the conduct of Christians in retaining possession of unjust power, is a great hindrance to the power of Christianity, by affording its enemies strong arguments against its efficacy, and discouraging honest enquirers after truth by such flagrant exhibitions of the selfishness of religious professors.’

It was the same spirit which pervaded the whole of his efforts for the enfranchisement of the masses. He seldom made a speech without putting forward the distinctively *Christian* grounds upon which he acted. It mattered not to him what was the character of his audience. He must have often been aware that many of those who heard him had small respect for the religious principles to which he appealed, but having an unfaltering faith in the fact that the Gospel was the truest foundation for human liberty, he was in that, as in other respects, ‘not ashamed of the Gospel,’ while his obvious simplicity and sincerity saved him from the imputation of hypocrisy or cant on the part of even the most sceptical of his hearers.

Nor can there be a doubt that the part he took did exercise a salutary influence over large bodies of the working men in checking the infidelity that was so rife among them, and recalling them to a respect for Christianity which they were on the eve of losing altogether.

At the time of his death a funeral sermon was preached for him by a gentleman who in early life had been a violent political chartist, but who is now one of the ablest and most respected ministers of the Baptist denomination, and the pastor of a large congregation belonging to that body in Birmingham. We refer to the Rev. Charles Vince. In delineating Mr. Sturge's character, Mr. Vince made some references to his own history strikingly illustrative of the remarks we have just made. Though that discourse was not published, we have the author's permission to cite the following passage from notes furnished to us by one of his hearers. The text was, 'He was a good man, and full of the Holy Ghost :—

'He manifested his goodness,' said Mr. Vince, 'in his supreme regard for God's will. . . . The question "What wilt thou have me do?" was no stranger to the lips of Joseph Sturge. In religion, morals, and benevolence, he recognised this basis for all his conduct. Even his very political opinions and proceedings were founded on it. I find that on one occasion when he offered himself for a seat in parliament, he commenced his speech on the hustings by announcing that his political creed was based upon the Scriptural injunction, "Whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye so unto them." You are aware that he sought to give every man a vote in making the laws which he is called upon to obey. "Ah!" say others, "let a man first secure the character that shall ensure his using his vote honestly and well." "Nay," said he, "that is not God's method. He first gives the privileges of a son to them that are ignorant and out of the way, and after that comes all the training that shall fit them for their high vocation."

'You may say this is a little matter, but whether it be so or not, it has a personal interest for me. Years ago, I held all the same principles in politics which Joseph Sturge held, but then I did so, not in his spirit, but in the spirit of the infidel

Sunday newspaper. Presently I came in contact with his writings and those of his coadjutors, and found them contending on *Christian* principles for those very things which I had sought as being destructive of religion and priestcraft. I found that priestcraft was not religion. The discovery opened to me a new world. I found that Joseph Sturge, and others like-minded with himself, saw the Pole-star of Truth, and had followed it, and that in the whole range of human affairs the following out of God's will is the true line of our interest and duty.'

To the same effect is the testimony of Mr. Henry Vincent, whose long and intimate association with the working classes gave him as ample opportunities of observation as any man in the kingdom. In a letter to the biographer he says :—

'The suffrage movement of which Joseph Sturge was the soul did good in everything. It brought about a better feeling between the middle and working classes, and allayed the fiercer exasperation of the people by proving that men of Christian character were willing to risk popularity with the wealthy and powerful in their desire to serve them. It pushed men of high character into prominence, and breathed, for the first time since the return of the Stuarts, a Christian principle into political action. It raised many men in sobriety by its moral appeals. I can bear testimony to the strong desire of Joseph Sturge that everything should be subordinated to the "higher law," and that he was moved in his political action "to do unto all men as he would they should do unto him." I was with him all through the Nottingham election in 1842. The moral effect of that contest was astonishing. In a town long accustomed to bribery, not a shilling was expended improperly, order reigned, virtue was extolled; the people for the time seemed as if they were swayed by an almost super-human influence. I have seen him in stormy assemblies, and have remarked the influence of his very presence in stilling clamour, and in calling forth the noblest sympathies of the

people. Many men there are, whom I need not name, now living useful lives, who may be called his political children.'

It cannot be denied, indeed, that the course which Mr. Sturge took on the suffrage question deeply grieved some of his friends. Partly from entire want of sympathy with his political views, and partly, also, undoubtedly from genuine solicitude for his spiritual interests, his political activities were observed with sorrow and disapproval by many members of his own religious society. We have before us, now, a bundle of letters of remonstrance written to him on the subject, most of them couched in language of anxious but most affectionate and kindly warning, but some indulging in harsh expressions which must, and did, deeply wound the sensitive heart against which they were directed. 'Amid such a scene of conflict as Joseph has entered upon,' says his sister in writing to a friend, 'one hardly dares glance into the future—so much trial, so many dangers must await him. He is already beginning to feel the shyness of friends, and at one monthly meeting there was an ebullition of something more.'

No doubt this alienation of old friends was a very bitter trial to him, but can we desire any better evidence of the strength of principle and purpose by which he was actuated than his persevering so steadfastly in the course he had adopted in the face of such opposition? We regret that we have failed to recover any of the answers he wrote to the remonstrant letters to which we have alluded, as they would no doubt have contained most interesting disclosures of the state of his mind in the midst of these trying circumstances. We are not, however, without some indications of what his feelings were while passing through the outward excite-

ments amidst which he was then living. They were of the same humble self-distrusting tone as was habitual with him. The first of the following letters to Mr. Lewis Tappan refers to one of those commercial hurricanes which visit the United States at intervals, and commit such sudden havoc on the fortunes of its merchants. Among many other large houses which foundered in that storm of 1842 was that of Arthur and Lewis Tappan. These admirable men, whose names are intimately associated with all enterprises of philanthropy and benevolence in America, had, by their industry and energy, grown from small beginnings to a great height of commercial prosperity. They had made the noblest use of their wealth, giving with an open hand not only their money, but their time, their influence, their personal service, to promote the cause of Christian truth and human freedom. That, however, did not save them from wreck at the time referred to. It is in allusion to this that Mr. Sturge writes, under date of 9 mo. 17, 1842:—

‘MY DEAR FRIEND,—I am in receipt of thy letter of the 31st ult., and am deeply concerned to hear of the final result of the winding up of the concern of A. and L. Tappan. I had hoped that it might have pleased Providence that it should have been so far otherwise as, at least, to have left you a comfortable means of support, and leisure to devote your *time*, if you could not money, to those objects which are so near and dear to you. But the ways of God are not as our ways, nor are His thoughts as our thoughts. In His fatherly corrections he often sees meet to try us most closely upon those points which we think most hard to bear, and to teach us there is such a thing as an unlawful desire for lawful things; and perhaps thy noble and generous-hearted brother, who wished only for wealth to enable him to lessen the sum of human misery, may be permitted to see that neither

his happiness nor his usefulness would have been promoted had his desires in this respect been granted. I hope and believe that the Divine blessing will accompany him to his retirement, and should his day of active labour be nearly closed, may he be permitted the assurance that his day's work has kept pace with the day, and that to him who feels that, through the boundless mercy of a crucified Redeemer, he has a well-grounded hope that he shall safely enter that city "whose walls are salvation, and whose gates are praise," it matters little whether he be actually employed or belong to those of whom it is said—

"They also serve who only stand and wait."

'Please remember me affectionately to him.'

In 1843, Mr. Lewis Tappan paid a visit to England to attend the Anti-Slavery Convention, of which we shall have presently to speak. He and Mr. Sturge were thoroughly congenial spirits, and the society of his friend had evidently afforded him great pleasure and encouragement. The following letter refers to this :—

'Thou would'st no doubt, hear the encouraging news about Texas long before we did; we must now watch that the abolition of slavery is included in the conditions of peace between Mexico and Texas, and do what we can to promote it.

'Thy kind expressions of thanks for any little attentions I was able to show thee, I felt quite undeserved, as they were very little in comparison to what I received of thee while in America. But my heart was too full to tell thee how much I felt when we parted, under the consideration that it was more than probable I should never again meet on this side of eternity, one to whom I felt united as to a brother, and whose hopeful and cheerful spirit had in our (to me) very instructive but too brief intercourse, animated my heart, so often weighed down with discouragement, not so much by

outward circumstances, as by the deep, and at times overwhelming, sense of my weakness and manifold sins of omission and commission, and my immeasurable distance from the state in which alone we can be permitted a place in that kingdom where nothing that is unholy can enter, while at the same time I cannot feel that assurance of personal interest in the atoning sacrifice of Him whose blood cleanseth from all sin, on which I could confidently rest while passing through the valley of the shadow of death. But perhaps, before I arrive there, a brighter view may in unmerited mercy be granted to me.'

As a further illustration of the earnest religious spirit in which the enterprise was prosecuted by those most prominently concerned in it, we may, we hope without impropriety, select a few sentences from the letters written to him at the time by one who, next to himself, bore the most important part in the movement, and was probably, of all his political associates, the one in most intimate sympathy of mind and heart with him. Mr. Miall thus writes to him on Jan. 28, 1842 :—

'The movement in which we are engaged is too mighty a one to be undertaken in any other spirit than that of deference to the Divine will, and dependence on Divine strength. Politically regarded, merely, it is full of danger. We are raising a power which we may be unable to control if chafed by aristocratic opposition. But faith in Him who "stills the noise of the waves and the tumults of the people" will, I doubt not, bring us through without violent collision. The more necessity is there to get our cause well founded in the religious portion of the public, before party men and politicians take part in it.'

A few months later he writes again to cheer his friend, 'lest the multitude of his perplexities should discourage him :—

‘When you entered upon your present course, sanguine as you might have been of success at no very distant day, you were of course prepared to meet with difficulties and disappointments. You had no personal end to serve. You obeyed the high and imperative dictates of conscience and religion. You have a right, therefore, to expect God’s blessing on your labours and sacrifices, and whether you attain your object or fail of obtaining it, you may yet expect the smile of the Universal Ruler on your efforts. I trust, therefore, you will never deny yourself the satisfaction of having done what you could. You are not responsible for results—you cannot command them. But you are under obligation to persevere in well-doing, even when everything would seem to be going wrong. If we live, we may have to sustain more distressing reverses than any we have yet seen, and nothing but a lively and active faith will bear us triumphantly through them all. Therefore, suffer me to say, in earnest sincerity, “Cheer up, brother;” this work is in God’s hands, and what He has designed He can accomplish.’

But what, perhaps, more than anything else, will throw light upon the temper in which Mr. Sturge had entered upon and endeavoured to pursue that part of his public course of which we are now speaking, is furnished us by a record of his conversations with his beloved sister Sophia when she was on her death-bed. The paper from which we are about to quote a few extracts was a strictly private document, written for his own comfort and profit immediately after her decease :—

‘Feeling that her end was approaching early on the afternoon of 1st day, the 26th, when I was alone with her, she said that before her death she wished to have had ability to converse with me and to encourage me, but intimated she now feared she might not have strength to do so. But she went on to

express her unshaken confidence that I should be preserved and supported. In reference to an enquiry of mine, whether I had not better withdraw altogether from public affairs, when I should no longer have her to watch over me, and to warn me of danger, she remarked, in substance, that she was not prepared to give me this advice, as, if I was preserved in a state of mind properly prayerful, humble, and watchful, it was a position in which so few bear a faithful testimony to our dear Saviour, it might not be right for me to desert it— that if I lived in humble dependence upon Divine aid from day to day, I should be able to see my path of duty and faithfully occupy it, saying at the same time that I had suffered from over anxiety and mental pressure, and want of sufficient time for quietude and retirement. She remarked on the inexpressible comfort it had been to her to have me so much with her during her illness, and signified that though she was then suffering so much from physical weakness, she was still favoured with a continuance of humble trust and faith in her Redeemer.'

On another occasion, when still nearer her death, she said :—

'That she had no doubt of the soundness of the principle on which I had advocated the rights of the people, and was quite satisfied with my having espoused their cause when they were oppressed and trampled upon, and when to do so was so unpopular that it was at the sacrifice of my own reputation. I had, however, committed many errors in the proceedings connected with it, greatly arising from acting too precipitately and yielding too much to the opinions of others, but that I had been, in an almost miraculous manner preserved from difficulties which might have been inextricable and irremediable. . . . She believed I had asked aid at these times of extremity where alone it was to be found, and that it had not been withheld from me.'

We may be very sure that that course of conduct could have been entered upon and pursued in no

irreligious spirit, respecting which the brother and sister could thus commune together amid the gathering shadows of eternity.

Before, however, entirely dismissing Mr. Sturge from the political arena, we must advert to one other occasion on which he appeared as candidate for a seat in parliament. In the years 1843-7 there arose a great educational controversy in this country. It sprung, immediately, from a measure for national education introduced into parliament in 1843, by Sir James Graham as a member of Sir Robert Peel's government. This was felt by the dissenters to be an unfair and dangerous measure, and a formidable opposition grew up against it, which obliged the ministers to withdraw the bill. The discussion, however, to which it gave rise, far from subsiding, continued with great animation for several years, ultimately resolving itself into a question of principle between the advocates of state and of voluntary education.

Mr. Sturge sided strongly with the latter, insomuch that when the Committee of the British and Foreign School Society, of which he had been a cordial supporter for many years, determined to accept aid from the Government, after doing all in his power to deter them from that resolution, he felt bound to withdraw from all connection with the institution. In doing so, he published the following letter, addressed

‘TO THE SUBSCRIBERS TO THE BRITISH AND FOREIGN
‘SCHOOL SOCIETY.

‘Having long held the opinion that pecuniary grants for the purpose of religious instruction in schools and colleges, from the general taxation of the country, were unsound in principle, I rejoice that recent circumstances have brought the subject

under public consideration in a manner to command a fuller and more general investigation of it than it has ever before received. The conviction is now widely spreading amongst different Christian denominations that such grants are not only opposed to the voluntary principle, but that they are a direct infringement of the rights of private conscience, the practical evils of which are greatly aggravated when any particular sect receives exclusive privileges from the State.

‘Under these circumstances, the surprise and regret which has been felt at the recent conclusion of the Committee of the British and Foreign School Society, to accept a part of their expenses from the Government, will doubtless be shared by a much more numerous portion of their supporters than would have been the case at any former period.

‘A distinction is drawn by many between national property appropriated to the support of schools where the religious instruction is confined to the authorised English translation of the Scriptures, and the examination and comments upon it are entrusted to teachers selected by a managing committee, composed of persons of different religious denominations—and grants made to colleges or schools connected with particular religious persuasions. On a candid examination, it will, however, be found that it is impossible to impart any religious instruction supported from a tax upon the *whole* people, without a violation of the same principle in the one case as the other: and at a meeting of the friends of the British and Foreign School Society, convened by the committee themselves last year, embracing those who were considered most entitled to give them advice and counsel, it was evident the feeling was so decidedly opposed to the receipt of any Government aid, that a motion to leave it to the discretion of the committee to accept it or not, was withdrawn.

‘Much as I deplore the step the committee has taken, I have never been so fully identified with the active labours of the institution as to consider it to be my duty to move a resolution at the approaching general meeting against it: yet in finally withdrawing from a Society to which I have for many years subscribed, and in the welfare of which I have

long felt a deep interest, I consider it right thus to state my reasons for doing so.

‘All past history, I believe, proves that institutions partly supported by voluntary, and partly by compulsory, pecuniary aid do not permanently prosper; and if the latter is resorted to at all, it is much better that the whole should be derived from this source. There is no reason which can be urged in favour of the Government paying a part, which does not apply to the whole; and the effects of the *Regium Donum* show that a small annual Government grant may make the recipients subservient to the State. It must also be obvious that the voluntary principle cannot be thus infringed without paralysing it; for those who are taxed for the support of an institution cannot be expected willingly also to subscribe to it. The objection, however, of paramount importance is, that it is a violation of the rights of conscience towards all who contribute to the taxation of the country, and who are honestly opposed to any part of the religious instruction given in the schools.

‘The country is now in great excitement in consequence of the proposed grant to the College of Maynooth, and many of the subscribers to the British and Foreign School Society are probably amongst its most decided opponents; but could not a Roman Catholic find grounds of equal validity to object to the grant made to the Borough Road School? It must be evident that any who are willing to accept Government aid for the dissemination of their own views of truth, cannot consistently object to similar grants to their Roman Catholic fellow-subjects, or to Jews, or even Mahomedans, and Hindoos.

‘It is deeply to be regretted that the committee have surrendered the high ground so long maintained by the Society, of giving a Scriptural education, aided only by voluntary contributions—and the importance of which was greater on account of the standard it upheld, than even the extent of instruction imparted. I hope, however, that they who can no longer support the Society in its new position, will feel called upon in an especial manner to promote education in their

respective localities; and should the unfavourable anticipations of the result of the step now taken by the committee be realised, it should never be forgotten that the labours of the British and Foreign School Society have been an inestimable blessing to the present generation.

‘Very respectfully,

‘JOSEPH STURGE.

‘Birmingham : 4th month (April), 24th, 1845.’

Owing to the prominent part taken by Mr. Edward Baines, now M.P. for Leeds, in this educational controversy, having in fact been the foremost leader of the voluntaries, a work which he performed with distinguished ability and courage, Leeds had become the principal battle-ground of the conflict. At the election of 1847, therefore, this question assumed in that town a very important position, and it was deemed a matter of great moment to select as a candidate one who, while he was thoroughly sound on that principle, would in other respects command the confidence and awaken the enthusiasm of the advanced liberal party. Mr. Sturge was held to combine these qualifications above any other public man known to the constituency. In compliance with an invitation from a committee appointed to nominate suitable representatives for the borough, he attended a general meeting of the liberal electors, and, after having explained his sentiments, a resolution was passed, with but one dissentient, pledging those present, in the event of his becoming candidate, to use their utmost exertions to secure his return. But faithful to his own principle as a friend of the unrepresented classes, Mr. Sturge declined to accept the candidateship unless an opportunity were afforded him of ascertaining the opinions of the *people*, who in his judgment were unjustly deprived

of their political rights. A public meeting of the inhabitants, electors, and non-electors was accordingly called in the Cloth Hall Yard, where he was received and adopted as the popular candidate with great enthusiasm. Of course voluntary education formed but one item of no great prominence in the thoroughly liberal creed which Mr. Sturge avowed and embodied in a very able address to the electors, which, after the preliminary measures we have described, he consented to issue. But this, like his former candidatures, ended in defeat, though in the present instance a very honourable defeat. His rivals—Messrs. Marshall and Beckett—were men of great wealth and local influence, and yet he polled no fewer than 1,976 votes. He had little hope of success from the first, and accepted the contest merely as a matter of principle. In writing to Mr. Tappan, under date of June 17, 1847, he says:—

‘I send herewith a “Leeds Mercury” newspaper, from which thou wilt see that I have been induced again to launch on the agitated ocean of political life. I believe under the circumstances I could not have taken another course with an easy mind, and I am thankful to say that in attending public meetings from day to day in contemplation of a contested election, I have been preserved in a degree of calmness that I could hardly have hoped for; and it has afforded me such an opportunity for the public announcement of great principles as of itself is an ample compensation for the time and labour it has occupied. It is also a most cheering circumstance to see how the people respond to great Christian principles, and especially to that of peace. The motives for strenuous opposition to my return are so strong, that it is at least very doubtful if I succeed; and if I am returned, my position will be such a responsible one that I hardly dare contemplate it. But if it is my right place and I am preserved in a right state of mind, strength will, no doubt, be afforded sufficient for the day.’

After it was over, he writes again :—

‘I send thee paper which, if thou think it worth thy while to read them, will give thee a little idea of the proceedings on such occasions in this country, as well as explain to thee the combination of influences which succeeded in placing me at the bottom of the poll, but with an amount of public enthusiasm in my favour as made defeat a triumph.’

Mr. Sturge was on several subsequent occasions invited to offer himself as a candidate for parliament. But he firmly, and without hesitation, declined all such invitations, and was wont to say, in the latter years of his life, that he deemed it one of the things for which he had to be thankful to Providence that he had failed to get into the House of Commons. It may be doubted, perhaps, whether he had the qualifications to shine much in that stormy arena. But we cannot conceive of any assembly in which his high character and pure patriotism would not have commanded respect and acquired influence.

CHAPTER XVI.

PHILANTHROPY NOT FORGOTTEN IN POLITICS.

Did not neglect his Philanthropic Objects during the Suffrage Movement—Fidelity to the Cause of the Slave—Conference called at Paris by French Abolitionists—Letter of Mr. W. Forster—Mr. Sturge goes—The French Government forbids the Meeting—Refuses M. Guizot's Hospitality—Second Anti-Slavery Convention—His Anxiety and Labour to make it Successful—Letters to Mr. Tappan and Mr. Whittier—Convention held at Freemasons' Hall—First Peace Convention—Originated by Mr. Sturge—The Care of it devolves upon him—Letters of Miss Sturge—Held at Freemasons' Tavern—Anxieties in Business at the Time—Continued Interest in West Indian Affairs—Correspondence with Missionaries—His high Estimation of their Character—Letter from Rev. John Clark—Watches intently the Progress of American Abolitionism—Extensive Correspondence with Friends there—Action respecting Texas—Letters from Mr. Whittier and Mr. Jay.

It must not, however, be supposed that, even in the most absorbing moments of the political agitation in which he had become involved, Mr. Sturge ever forgot or neglected the great philanthropic interests to which so large a portion of his earlier life had been devoted. He was not one of those men of mere impulse, who mount and ride a particular hobby with great vehemence for a while, and then gradually cool down into indifference, or turn aside to go in quest of some novel speculation or pursuit that may have fascinated their fancy. He possessed, on the contrary, a singular tenacity of purpose. To enter upon a new course of usefulness did not, in his case, imply any desertion of the old. It is, indeed, very touching to observe how

he contrived to make almost all forms of public activity, in which he ever bore part, subserve, in some way or other, the cause of his poor black clients. When in early life he became a member of the political union, he used his influence with that body to send a petition to parliament, to which a very large number of signatures was attached, for the abolition of slavery. We have seen how he did not shrink from resisting all the power of the League, when he thought it was taking a course unjust to the slave. And when he was in the thick of the suffrage movement, he induced his colleagues to join him in an address to the democratic party in America, pointing out to them how seriously liberal principles were dishonoured and impeded in Europe by republican complicity with slavery in the United States. Mr. Whittier in a letter to him, dated 28th of 2nd mo. 1845, says: 'I notice with pleasure that the Complete Suffrage Committee have prepared an address to the democratic party in this country, on their subserviency to the slave power. Everything of that kind helps us. The better portion of that party are beginning to take abolition ground.'

But it was not merely by such incidental methods as these that Mr. Sturge continued in that season of political excitement to serve the anti-slavery cause. By the wonderful faculty for hard work which he possessed, he managed to devote as much attention and energy to it even then as most men of business would have deemed quite enough to occupy all the time they could spare for public and philanthropic objects. To some of his services in this direction we must now return.

In the early part of 1842, the French abolitionists determined to hold a conference and public meeting at Paris, with a view, more especially, to promote the

extinction of slavery in the French colonies. A letter written on their behalf by the Duke de Broglie, was sent to many of the anti-slavery societies in this country, asking them to appoint delegates to attend the proposed convention. Mr. Sturge was, of course, one of those appointed. He may probably have at first hesitated about going, doubtful how far he could be of any use, owing to his ignorance of the French language. But the following letter from his friend, Mr. William Forster, of Norwich, for whom he cherished a respect amounting to reverence, no doubt decided him. It is very interesting, as showing the extreme importance which the writer attached to the maintenance of the *pacific* principle, in connection with the anti-slavery movement, as well as the high estimate he had formed of his friend's firmness of character and loyalty to his own convictions.

'Earlham Road, Norwich: 2nd month, 13th, 1842.

'MY DEAR FRIEND,—I have not heard with any degree of certainty, of a single individual likely to attend the proposed Anti-slavery Conference at Paris. Of course, I am entirely ignorant of thy intentions, but I cannot be satisfied without writing thee a short and hasty letter by this evening's post, just to say that it will be much of a relief to me to find that thou art given up to the service. I can always write to thee in perfect freedom and confidence, and in the openness which subsists between us, I wish to say that on this important occasion, I feel very anxious for the right upholding of the great principle on which our Anti-slavery Society is founded. *Moral, religious, and pacific* is our motto; it forms the basis of our constitution, and it is much to be desired that it should be kept constantly in view by those who go to represent the great body of British abolitionists in that assembly. I know of nobody who takes a more decided view on this point than thyself; therefore, I cannot but be desirous that the delegation may not be deprived of thy counsel and assistance. Do not

be discouraged as to thy ignorance of the language, for notwithstanding thou mayest not have a word of French, *that* need not prevent thee from being of the most essential service to the cause, and who knows to what degree thou mayest be helpful in keeping others up to the mark.

‘It may not be within the province of our committee in New Broad Street to dictate to the associations in the country; they must, I believe, be left to form their own minutes or resolutions in their own language, on the appointment of their delegates. But I very much wish that the minute of our own committee in London may introduce a clause – no matter how short—that shall fully recognise our great principle. I also hope that those who go will not be backward in maintaining and advocating the position which the society has held from its origin, that much and deeply as we deplore the African Slave Trade, and heartily as we abominate all its cruelty and wickedness, we entertain no hope for the extermination of the slave trade but by the extinction of slavery itself, and that whenever, and so long as slavery exists—so long as man is regarded as a chattel, an article of sale and barter—a *thing* subject to inheritance and bequest, there will be, and there *must* be, a slave trade.

‘It will, I think, be wisdom in our Anti-slavery friends to keep themselves entirely distinct from the question pending between Great Britain and France, in reference to the right of search, &c. It so much entrenches upon what we consider to be comprehended in the term “*pacific*,” and goes so far towards giving countenance to the employment of an armed force for the suppression of the slave trade, that we cannot, I believe, as an Anti-slavery body, take any part in it; and I cannot but wish we may keep it out of the columns of the “*Reporter*.”

‘Thou must forgive me, my dear friend, if I am too urgent upon thee, for I do feel a very strong desire that the conference may not suffer from the want of thy steady and manly adherence to principle, and thy thorough-going straightforwardness.

‘I am, thy truly affectionate friend,

‘WM. FORSTER.’

In company with a considerable number of other gentlemen from various parts of the United Kingdom, Mr. Sturge duly presented himself in the French metropolis at the beginning of March. Great interest had been excited in this country in reference to the meeting at Paris, not merely because it might have an important bearing on the anti-slavery cause, but because it promised to initiate among our neighbours that system of moral agitation which had been productive of such large and salutary results among ourselves. Unhappily, however, the foreign delegates found on their arrival that the French Government had taken alarm, and, although the meeting had been convened under the auspices of such names as De Broglie, Odillon Barrot, Lamartine, Passy, De Tracy, G. Lafayette, &c., it was peremptorily forbidden by the ministry. There was, however, a private conference attended by some sixty or seventy gentlemen, at which a good deal of information was given on the results of emancipation in the West Indies, as well as on the state of the anti-slavery question generally in various parts of the world. M. Guizot, who was then at the head of the Government, evidently half ashamed of the interdict he had thought himself bound to impose on a meeting assembled for such purposes, tried to make up by personal courtesies for the ungraciousness of his public conduct. He invited the foreign delegates to dine with him. Most of them accepted the invitation. But Mr. Sturge, indignant, and perhaps a little contemptuous at the moral cowardice of the man, who did not dare to allow a number of philanthropists to meet, to discuss a question of pure benevolence in the capital of a country professing to enjoy the blessings of a constitutional government, declined to share his hospitality.

In the early part of 1843, whilst in the thick of the suffrage agitation, Mr. Sturge had to devote a large measure of time and attention to two important meetings about to be held in London in the summer of that year, namely, the Second Anti-slavery Convention, and the First Peace Convention. The Anti-slavery Convention of 1840 had been so eminently successful in attracting the attention of the civilised world to the cause of the enslaved, and in giving a fresh impulse to the exertions of those who were working for emancipation, that it was resolved to hold a second meeting of a similar nature in 1843. As on the former occasion, much of the preliminary work, in the way of counsel and correspondence, devolved upon Mr. Sturge. He writes to Mr. Lewis Tappan so early as June 1842 :—

‘MY DEAR FRIEND,—Although, in addition to my other engagements, I have been put in nomination for the representation of Nottingham, as a sort of personification of “complete suffrage,” I do not like for the packet to sail without writing a few lines. Thou wilt see that the time for the Anti-slavery conference is announced for June 1843, at Exeter Hall. If life and health permit, I trust thou wilt be there. The accounts of the state of the cause in your land are encouraging, and I hope that you will be able again to start the “Reporter.” I am glad to find there is so general a disposition in the Northern States to oppose the annexation of Texas. I fear we can do little to help you on this side of the water till we get a thorough reform in parliament, and the recent disclosures in the House of Commons have done much to prepare the way for this. Such is the state of things in the present House, that we cannot get a member properly qualified to bring forward the East India question this session.

‘The Philadelphia “Friends,” in their Meeting for Sufferings, have remonstrated with our friends in England on account of the letter I addressed to the society when at New York. The society here, however, have but little sympathy

with such a state of things as prevails there, and the reading of this remonstrance, with some remarks I was allowed to make afterwards, have, I believe, helped our Anti-slavery cause on this side the water.

‘I hope we shall shortly get out a circular in reference to the call of the Convention for 1843, and that we shall take care to be so definite, that no possible mistake can be pleaded as to those who shall be entitled to a seat in it. It has also been resolved to hold a peace convention at the same time.

‘Very sincerely thy affectionate friend,

‘JOSEPH STURGE.’

And even at Nottingham itself, while in the thick of the election, he finds time to write to Mr. Whittier on the same subject. In a letter, dated ‘Nottingham, August 2, 1842,’ he says:—

‘I am favoured with thy welcome letter of the 13th of last month. I know thou wilt excuse my sending a very brief reply, when I tell thee we are on the eve of the long-delayed Nottingham election. The nomination takes place on the 4th and the polling on the 5th inst. My opponent is John Walter, the principal proprietor of the ‘Times’ newspaper, who, in addition to his own great wealth and the influence and almost unlimited wealth of the aristocratic party, has at his command a paper, perhaps the most extensively circulated and of the greatest influence in the world. Yet such is the state of popular feeling here, that it is yet doubtful if John Walter will go to the poll, and it seems to be generally admitted that the only chance his party have of a majority is by the most extensive bribery, which they cannot now resort to without imminent risk of being detected, and their candidate losing his seat.

‘I am glad to have so cheering an account of the aspect of your Anti-slavery cause, and though the struggle in which I am engaged here in favour of the suffrage so occupies my time that I cannot give so much as I wish to the old cause, yet I believe if we once carry a measure of complete repre-

sentation in this country, that few things will more promote the downfall of slavery throughout the world. I find from Lewis Tappan they have already appointed six deputies to the Convention here next year. I am glad of this, as it will stimulate others to do the same. Perhaps your society can ere long appoint a deputation, and of course I depend upon thy being one. Our cause wears, at present, a gloomy aspect in France, and our Tory Government in this country is, of course, a drag upon our wheel; and we are a good deal alarmed as to what may be the consequence of the measure just passed to sanction the importation of hill coolies to the Mauritius.'

Again, writing to the same friend, January 3, 1843, he strongly urges him to attend the Anti-slavery and Peace Conventions :—

'I am particularly anxious,' he says, 'that each of your free States should be represented on this important occasion, and I hope thou wilt leave no effort untried to secure the appointment of such friends and delegates as thou wilt consider a real help and strength to our cause by their presence. . . . I am very much pleased to hear that the gallows system is abolished in Vermont, and that you hope to follow their example. My friend John Barry, the untiring advocate of that cause here, has lost by death his right-hand help—Sydney Taylor, an able writer in one of our daily papers—and his own health is much shattered by his great exertions, but I know he will be much rejoiced to hear what you are doing.'

The Anti-slavery Convention was held at Freemasons' Hall, beginning on June 13, and extending over nearly a week; upwards of 300 delegates attended. It is not necessary to dwell at any length on the proceedings of this meeting, as they very much resembled those of the previous Convention in 1840. Perhaps its most distinctive feature was a long and animated debate which took place on the question of introducing

slave-grown sugar into the British market, which the former Convention had unanimously condemned, but which the progress of the free trade agitation had since then brought before public attention in a more pressing and practical form. A resolution was proposed by the Rev. Thomas Spencer to revoke the judgment of 1840, and was ably supported by Mr. Anstie, Mr. Cobden, Mr. Miall, and others; but as strenuously resisted by Mr. Blair, Mr. E. N. Buxton, Mr. Scoble, Mr. Sturge, &c. Ultimately, to avoid dividing the Convention, the subject was disposed of by the previous question.

In noticing Mr. Sturge's visit to America in 1841, we remarked that one of the objects he had in view was to promote the cause of international peace. There were sundry questions at that time pending between our Government and that of the United States, in respect to which he felt great solicitude lest they should lead to a breach of friendly relations. He was anxious, moreover, to promote more active cooperation between the friends of peace in England and America, in the hope that their united efforts might be of some service in calling the attention of the Christian world to the infinite evils attending the custom of war, and the duty and practicability of adopting such measures as might tend to diminish the frequency of war, and ultimately, by God's blessing, lead to its abolition. With this view he entered into earnest communication with some of the leading friends of the cause in America, especially Dr. Channing and the Honourable William Jay. He was deeply interested in a plan for the preservation of international peace submitted to him by the latter gentleman, which has become familiar enough since then, but which, we believe, Mr. Jay had the merit of

first suggesting. His proposal was, that any two nations, entering into alliance, should embody in their treaty a clause, mutually binding them to refer any dispute or difficulty that may arise between them to the arbitration of one or more friendly powers. To afford Mr. Sturge a further opportunity of conferring with those interested in the peace question, the American Peace Society convened a meeting of members of that society, and other influential gentlemen, which was held at Boston on July 29, 1841. The following minute, handed to him by the gentleman who officiated as secretary, will explain the proceedings :—

‘The meeting was called for the purpose of meeting Mr. Joseph Sturge from England, and there were present most of the active members of the American Peace Society.

‘Amasa Walker, Esq., was chosen chairman, and J. P. Blanchard secretary.

‘Mr. Sturge addressed the meeting, and suggested the expediency of calling, at some future time, a convention of the friends of peace, of different nations, to deliberate upon the best method of adjusting international disputes; and offered, for the consideration of the meeting, a plan proposed by Judge Jay, in which all the friends of peace could unite.

‘The meeting was then addressed by several gentlemen, who cordially approved the plan proposed, and subsequently the following resolutions were unanimously adopted :

‘Resolved—That this meeting receives with great pleasure the suggestion of our friend Joseph Sturge of England, of a general conference of the friends of peace, at the earliest practicable opportunity, in London, to consult on the measures that are best adapted to promote universal peace among the nations of the earth; and they respectfully refer the subject to the executive of the London Peace Society for their decision, on correspondence and consultation with the friends of the cause in this and other countries.

‘Resolved—That the suggestion of Judge Jay, of the in-

sertion of a clause in all conventional treaties between nations, mutually binding the parties to submit all international disputes, during the continuance of such treaties, to the arbitration of some one or more friendly powers, presents a definite and practicable object of effort worthy of the serious attention of the friends of peace. And this meeting recommends to the friends of the cause in different countries to petition their respective Governments in favour of the measure.'

On his return to England, Mr. Sturge submitted these resolutions to the Committee of the London Peace Society, who, after a preliminary conference of the friends of the society, held in London in May 1842, determined to call such a convention as was recommended by the Boston resolutions. The arrangements for this meeting became a matter of much anxiety to Mr. Sturge, for, just at the time when the necessary preparations had to be made, the secretary of the London Society, the Rev. N. M. Harry, suddenly died. By this painful event, the responsibility of the conference seemed to devolve almost entirely upon him, at whose instance it had been undertaken, and that at a moment when he was already distracted with so many other cares public and private. In Miss Sturge's letters there are frequent references to this point:—

'If Joseph,' she says, in one of them, 'had not still greater weight more closely pressing upon him, he would be feeling anxious about the prospects of the Peace Convention; there is so much danger of its proving a failure for want of some one at the helm.'

Again, writing to the same friend, she says:—

'My present object in writing is to consult thee about the Peace Convention. No person has yet appeared able and willing to take in hand the conduct of the meeting. . . . Do

cast about thee to think of some person competent to this work. His heart should be in the cause; he should be perfectly sound in principle, and gifted with the power of managing men with their own consent. This latter, thou wilt perhaps say, is something Utopian; but is not some portion of this ability necessary to all leaders?’

Happily, the attention of the committee was directed in time to the Rev. John Jefferson, who afterwards became the secretary of the Society, and who conducted the affairs of the conference with great judgment and ability. It was held at the Freemasons’ Tavern on the 22nd of June, and the two following-days. Mr. Charles Hindley, M.P., was elected as president, and the following gentlemen as vice-presidents:—Joseph Brotherton, Esq., M.P., Joseph Sturge, John Tappan (of Boston, U.S.), the Marquis de la Rochefoucauld Liancourt, Amasa Walker, and Thomas Cock, M.D. Many valuable papers were presented, discussing the question of peace and war in its various aspects, and the meeting proved on the whole satisfactory and successful. ‘The Peace Convention,’ says Miss Sturge, ‘was lively, and full of interest.’

It is impossible not to be struck with the simple and self-forgetting earnestness with which this admirable brother and sister devoted themselves to doing good, as others do to the pursuit of wealth, fame, or fashion. The amount of labour through which Mr. Sturge passed at this period of his life was something marvellous. His correspondence alone would have sufficed to occupy the time and attention of an ordinary man. But he was, besides, constantly attending meetings, committees, conferences, on the suffrage, anti-slavery, and peace questions, and travelling extensively in various parts of the kingdom in promotion of these and other objects.

And if anything could add to our surprise and admiration at his extraordinary energy, it is the fact now disclosed in his sister's letters, that in the very crisis of these public exertions, the commercial firm of which he was the head was suddenly involved in one of those terrible squalls to which, at that time, the corn trade was so peculiarly liable. His brother, who, as much as possible, was willing to spare him all the anxieties of business that he might more thoroughly devote himself to those public interests dear to the heart of both, was no longer able to weather the storm alone:—

‘During the last few months,’ writes Miss Sturge, under date of Dec. 1, 1842, ‘Joseph and Charles have been losing money with far more rapidity than they ever gained it. Charles, alarmed by the suddenness of the emergency, was obliged hastily to recall Joseph from Scotland, and since then it has been a continued struggle with stupendous difficulties. They have not probably quite reached the bottom yet; but the way seems clearer than it was, and I am comforted to observe that both of them have now regained a stronger tone of mind. Under such circumstances, there are not many besides Joseph that could pay attention to other affairs than his own. But excepting now and then, when body and mind were almost exhausted, he has not relaxed his exertions in those causes which are dear to him.’

Then she passes away from these private anxieties, to beg her friend to assist them in finding some person ‘able and willing to take in hand the conduct of the Peace Convention.’ We cannot doubt, indeed, that this unselfish devotion to great objects was its own reward. It presented a most salutary diversion from those private cares which otherwise, by incessant brooding upon them, might have eaten into the soul as doth a canker. A generous sympathy for others’ weal is often the best balm for our own bruise.

It is probable, indeed, that the severest part of the trial to Mr. Sturge and his sister was the obligation it imposed upon them to check the flow of charity which it was their delight to indulge. Miss Sturge, writing to her friend, who was then raising a subscription to meet some emergency in the case of a West India missionary, says:—

‘Joseph and I have been this morning talking over the matter of J. R., and although we have not fully determined the means, we have, I think, decided to furnish thee somehow or other with the balance of the sum thou art desirous to remit. Joseph’s own resources are so diminished, that he has to consider how the one pound he must now give, instead of the ten pounds he was wont to give, may be best applied. If tempted to regret anything about the late election it is the cost of it, which, though it was managed in many respects with scrupulous economy, yet after all falls heavily upon crippled means. I do not say this to discourage thee, my dear friend, but to excuse our delay and contrivance. Yet even at this moment, when it would have been so peculiarly congenial to Joseph’s feelings to have given more liberally, I see, and believe that he does also, more clearly than ever the blessing of having been so stripped.’

But the public labours of Mr. Sturge, extensive as they were, very imperfectly represent his services, especially to the cause of the negro. It is difficult, indeed, without swelling this memoir to undue proportions, to give the reader any adequate idea of what he was doing in this respect, month by month, and almost day by day, through a long succession of years. He maintained a constant and elaborate correspondence with the leading missionaries in the West Indies, so long as they and he lived, with Knibb, and Burchell, and Phillippo, and Oughton, and Clark, and Ketley, and others. He had visited these men in the scene of

their labours, and knew well the moral heroism they had displayed in protecting the rights and in toiling for the moral elevation of a despised and down-trodden race. And ever after he held them in the highest estimation; and when in 1840 he took the chair at a great meeting held in Exeter Hall, to give a public welcome to Mr. Knibb on his arrival in England, he bore an emphatic testimony to their character. They had been charged with being too political, and this was his reply to the charge:—

‘I am one of those who have never been able to see that a Christian was not equally bound to discharge his political as his religious duties. We read that the advent of Him whose doctrine all missionaries preach, and whose example they profess to follow, was ushered in by the anthem of peace on earth and goodwill towards men. He beautifully united, in his own life, attention to the temporal and the spiritual wants and maladies of those by whom He was surrounded; and if ever there was an instance in which the Divine blessing rested upon an endeavour to imitate this example—making due allowance for the weakness and inferiority of all human instruments—it is to be found in the field of Baptist missionary labour in Jamaica.’

It was his delight, therefore, to cheer these brave men on amid their labours and sufferings, not only by his sympathy, advice, and encouragement, but by freely opening his purse to aid them in their efforts for the improvement of the coloured peasantry, and by interposing the shield of his influence between them and their enemies and detractors. Piles of his letters to them, extending from 1837 to 1859, the year of his death, now lie before us, showing with what unabated interest he followed the varying fortunes of the colonies, and with what combined wisdom and kindness he aided

and counselled and comforted the missionaries. Rather, however, than give lengthy extracts from these letters, the biographer will permit one of the missionaries themselves, the Rev. John Clark, whom Mr. Sturge not only honoured as a faithful minister of Christ, but loved as a friend, to speak for the rest. After describing the horrors of the apprenticeship system, Mr. Clark goes on:—

‘You may therefore imagine the joy with which we heard of the intended visit of Mr. Sturge and his associates towards the close of 1836, to enquire into the working of the apprenticeship.

‘On February 2, 1837, I had the happiness of welcoming Joseph Sturge and his esteemed companion, Thomas Harvey, to my house. It was a relief to my burdened heart to pour out to them all I knew and thought and felt of the horrible apprenticeship. Never can I forget Mr. Sturge expressing his hope that it would be abolished. This far exceeded all I ventured to anticipate. Much I thought might be done to mitigate its cruelties, but I never imagined that the British Government, still less the colonial legislatures, would abolish the system one day sooner than the law had fixed for its termination. I had not learnt the resolution, courage, and power that lay under the quiet exterior of Joseph Sturge.

‘Mr. Sturge’s interest in the welfare of the negro did not cease with his emancipation. He exerted himself successfully to prevent the sanction of the British Government being given to laws passed by the colonial legislatures which would have divested their freedom of its chief advantages. He aided with the loan of a considerable sum of money in the purchase of land for the formation of free villages; he assisted largely in the establishment and carrying on of schools for the education of the young; a female normal school was established and maintained for three years, principally at his expense; when the cholera raged so fearfully throughout this island as to decimate its population, he contributed liberally and obtained the aid of others to meet the expenses incurred in aiding the

sufferers, and in mitigating its calamitous results; an immigration law was passed by our legislature which would have reduced the immigrants to a state of semi-slavery, but it was disallowed by the queen in council, mainly through his efforts and influence. In short, he was ever ready zealously and liberally to cooperate in every effort to promote the temporal and spiritual welfare of his fellow-men. If ever the words of the patriarch were applicable to any man, they were to Joseph Sturge: "When the ear heard me, then it blessed me, and when the eye saw me, it gave witness to me, because I delivered the poor that cried, and the fatherless and him that had none to help him. The blessing of him that was ready to perish came upon me, and I caused the widow's heart to sing for joy. I was eyes to the blind, and feet was I to the lame. I was a father to the poor, and the cause which I knew not, I searched out. And I brake the jaws of the wicked, and plucked the spoil out of his teeth;" not, however, by physical force, but by the power of truth. Yet, what self-renunciation, what deep humility, what tender compassion, what charity, marked his whole conduct! But it was by the grace of God he was what he was. The Saviour's love was shed abroad in his heart and manifested in his daily life.

'I know not how to speak of Mr. Sturge as a personal friend. His sympathy in trouble, his counsel and aid in every difficulty, his joy in all my happiness, can never be forgotten, nor their blessed influence ever cease to be felt.

'Never did I know anyone with a more sincere and simple faith in Christ. Like every man who thinks for himself, he felt there were mysteries in religion which he could not grasp, but he was sure that in the light of heaven all would be made plain: on the work of the atonement, however, he would speak with great clearness and decision; he renounced all hope of acceptance with God on the ground of good works, trusting in the precious blood of Christ for salvation.

'During my two visits to England I had the privilege of spending some time under his hospitable roof and of holding frequent intercourse with him, and the more intimate the knowledge of his character and conduct, the more one was

compelled to admire and love him. Like Nathaniel, he was "an Israelite indeed, a man without guile." It was impossible to be much with him without observing one trait in his character—his jealousy for the honour of religion. The only occasions on which I ever observed anything like indignation was when the professed disciples of Christ became the advocates or excusers of iniquity. It grieved him to the soul to see or hear the authority of the Saviour whom he loved so fervently brought forward in defence of sin.'

The remarks we have made as respects the West Indies, are no less applicable to the unfaltering interest with which he followed all vicissitudes of the anti-slavery movement in the United States. Here also he maintained a constant correspondence with some of the prominent abolitionists, such as the Hon. W. Jay, Mr. Whittier, and Mr. Lewis Tappan. And it was not merely by sympathy, counsel, and encouragement that he helped the cause, but often also by liberal contributions, of which there are frequent acknowledgments in Mr. Tappan's letters. It was not often that political action of any kind could with advantage be taken in this country bearing upon American slavery. When such occasions, however, occurred, Mr. Sturge left no exertions untried to bring the right influence to bear upon our Government. When in 1840, for instance, the rumour reached him that the liberal administration then in office was about to enter into a commercial treaty with Texas—which had been wrested from Mexico by American fillibusters, in shameless violation of all principles of international law, and avowedly for the purpose of extending the area of slavery—a treaty that would be tantamount to a recognition of its independence, he at once took the alarm. In a letter to Mr. William Forster, dated Nov. 24, 1840, he writes:—

'A few of our friends, including George Stacey, had a little conference this morning respecting Texas, and it was concluded not to take any step until we were in possession of more information on the subject, particularly as regards the conditions of the treaty, and it was thought desirable that J. H. Tredgold and myself should go to the Foreign Office either to-morrow or next day, in the event of not hearing from Lord Palmerston, to obtain, if possible, a copy of the treaty. . . . I have some hope it will not be found so virtual a recognition of Texian independence as would appear from what has been published, for some of the articles, I think, bear evident traces of being drawn up by General Hamilton's party. It is, however, I fear, bad enough, and will require the strongest remonstrance on our part.'

He had already written to Mr. O'Connell, whose vigilance and zeal on all matters connected with the anti-slavery question were beyond impeachment, and immediately received the following reply:—

'Derrynane Abbey: November 24, 1840.

'MY DEAR FRIEND,—I had just made up my mind to write to you upon the subject-matter of your letter—I mean the Texas question—when that letter reached me. I never felt more afflicted upon any political subject than I did at the announcement in the newspapers that Lord Palmerston had entered into a commercial treaty with a nest of land-pirates. Already, he has been upon the very verge of plunging us into all the horrors of war upon the most uninteresting of all possible grounds, that is, which of two barbarians shall misgovern, for each of them would misgovern, the unhappy inhabitants of Syria. We have escaped (if we *have* escaped) all the crimes of war, by the king of the French wisely submitting to the humiliation of the Syrian arrangement being made without his concurrence. In the meantime our natural alliance with France is broken off; the French people are insulted and irritated, and will, the first opportunity, seek means of revenge. . . . There is no occasion to write to

Lord Palmerston or anybody else with respect to the effect of making that treaty. It is a direct recognition of the independence, as a state, of the Texians. That state is as much recognised by this treaty as France or the United States. It is admitted into the comity of nations. Their ambassador would have a right to be presented to our queen, and we of course will have a diplomatic agent in one of the "shantys" of what is called the city of Houston.

'Believe me,

'Respectfully and faithfully yours,

'DANIEL O'CONNELL'

It appears, however, that the Whig ministry was overturned before the treaty could be ratified, for we find Mr. Sturge writing to Mr. Tappan, October 10, 1841:—

'Thou wilt be highly gratified with the annexed particulars of our interview with Lord Aberdeen. It is very encouraging to find that the Texan treaty is not yet ratified. It is, in my opinion, of great importance that this fact should be published far and wide.'

The American gentlemen we have named above were eminently competent to keep him well instructed, not only with regard to the facts, but the philosophy of the anti-slavery agitation in the United States. Indeed, out of this correspondence a pretty complete history might be written, if it were our business to write it, of the struggles, reverses, and triumphs of the cause in America during the last twenty years. The most salient fact these letters reveal is the steady progress it made in the face of all opposition. His correspondents have often to bewail the apathy of the churches, the unfaithfulness of the clergy, the time-serving of leading politicians, and the subserviency of congress to the slaveholding power. In spite of all, however, their cry

ever is, with the persecuted Galileo—‘*It moves for all that*.’

We shall venture on a very few extracts here, illustrative of this statement. Mr. Whittier, in October 1843, says:—

‘The anti-slavery cause has never been more rapidly gaining strength than at this time. Our Conventions during the last three months in various sections have been larger than usual, and full of enthusiasm and courage. . . . There is now an almost perfect unanimity in the anti-slavery ranks as to the expediency of independent political action. Judge Jay, S. M. Gates, member of Congress for New York, and our excellent friend, Lewis Tappan, are now with us on this point openly and decidedly. . . . Heaven bless O’Connell for his noble speech on American slavery at the Irish Repeal meeting. It was the blow of a giant, well-directed and terrible in its execution, as Bruce’s battle-axe at Bannockburn. . . . Hast thou read in our papers the triumphal processions which everywhere greeted John Quincy Adams in his late journey through the State of New York? Never yet was a private citizen more honoured by men of all parties and sects. At the city of New York, Albany, Rochester, Utica, Buffalo, and other places, the whole population turned out to welcome him, and do homage to the man who has so defended liberty. Admiration has been extorted from the bitterest enemies of emancipation. . . . It is some consolation to feel that, the opposition of Friends and other sects notwithstanding, the cause of the poor slave is gaining daily a deep hold upon that Christian sympathy which breaks over all sectarian prejudices and restrictions, and, like the Samaritan, stoops even to heal the wounded Jew. Blessed of our heavenly Father, the cause will triumph over every obstacle.’

In 1844, he writes:—

‘We have very cheering accounts of the progress of our cause in Virginia and Kentucky. Thou remembers, of course, our little meeting in Wilmington (Del.) with some of the

friends of emancipation. The seed then sown is now, I understand, beginning to spring up. By a letter from there I learn that vigorous, but of course cautious and carefully-directed efforts are now making in that State to redeem it from the curse of slavery; and from my knowledge of the men engaged in it I hope much from the movement. In Maryland the 'Visitor,' a paper published in Baltimore, in sight of Slaughter's slave-den, has opened its columns to anti-slavery writings, and has published several excellent articles.'

In 1846, he writes again :—

'The vote for liberty in Massachusetts is this year, as near as I can gather it from the returns, a little rising 10,000, a gain of about 20 per cent. We have elected six members of the State Legislature. This is not as well as I hoped. But the now dominant party (the Whigs) have been compelled by the rising tide of abolition to move with it, and some of their leading men are almost with us. Among them are Charles Adams,* son of the ex-president, and Charles Sumner, a young lawyer of great promise, who has signalised himself as the ardent friend of peace and the abolition of capital punishments.'

In 1848 he writes :—

'I trust the American papers have kept thee informed of the progress of things here. The adhesion of ex-president Van Buren, once a decided opponent to the liberty platform, bringing with him a host of able and influential men, the very flower of the democratic party, is an event of signal importance. Our vote will be more than four-fold what it was last year, unless I greatly miscalculate. The enclosed report of the Pennsylvania and Delaware Society gives a condensed and unexaggerated picture of the state of things in this country as respects the slavery question. The discussion has penetrated into all the slave states—Kentucky, Missouri, Maryland, and Virginia are moving. A Free-soil

* Now Minister of the United States in London.

Association has been formed in the district of Columbia. Delaware will, I trust, be a free state this winter. . . . If thou couldst be here now, I know it would gladden thy heart to witness the great change that has taken place. Instead of a few abolitionists here and there, as when thou wert here, the whole community is discussing the question. I am filled with thankfulness in view of the great moral revolution.'

And even in 1851, immediately after the passing of the Fugitive Slave Law, Mr. Jay writes as if that great wickedness itself had been for the furtherance of the cause :—

'You will know what a mighty effort has been made by our Northern traders in Southern votes and merchandise, under the leadership of Daniel Webster, to roll back the anti-slavery tide. To a certain extent they have succeeded. The commercial interest in the great towns, through a rivalry for the Southern trade, has professed great slacrity in slave-catching, and political aspirants for office under the Federal Government find it expedient to make slave-hunting the text of patriotism. But the religious feeling of the community, that is, of those who are not preeminently "gentlemen of property and standing," is shocked by the enormous cruelty and injustice of the Fugitive Law. To overcome this feeling, which in its demonstrations is exceedingly inconvenient to our merchants and office-seekers, the clergy have been urged by the press and other agencies to come out in support of the law. Some pastors, who preach in fine churches to rich and fashionable city congregations, have complied. But notwithstanding the great pressure, only a few of the *chief* priests have made common cause with the Pharisees in exalting the authority of an Act of Congress over the commands of God. As far as I can learn, they do not exceed two or three dozen. The rebuke which these reverend time-servers have just received from their English brethren will, I hope, do them good. Multitudes of our *country* clergy have, in a manner worthy of their office, counselled, not resistance, but disobedience, to this most wicked law.'

And so we might proceed with these extracts to a much larger extent, all tending to show that the tide of Christian sentiment was rising steadily year by year, and must ultimately, though by comparatively slow degrees, cause the ark of liberty to float high above all obstacles on the American Continent. What deep gratification this afforded to Mr. Sturge may be readily imagined. Again and again does he, in his letters written during the time of the Russian war, describe himself as turning away sickened from that spectacle of blood, to contemplate the progress of what he hoped and believed would prove one of the most glorious illustrations in the history of the world of the power of the weapons that are not carnal, but mighty, through God, to the pulling down of the strongholds of iniquity.

Alas! for the change. 'But the righteous is taken away from the evil to come.'

CHAPTER XVII.

DEATH OF HIS SISTER—EVANGELICAL ALLIANCE.

Sophia Sturge—Her Character—Her Devotion to her Brother—Extracts from her Letters—Her Illness—And Death—Letter from Mr. Sturge on the Occasion—His second Marriage—Mr. Whittier's Lines on Miss Sturge's Death—The Evangelical Alliance—Its Object and Constitution—Mr. Sturge remonstrates with Rev. J. A. James on its Test-Creed—Mr. James's Reply—The Question of Slavery before the Alliance—First Invitation to America contained no Reference to the Question—The Birmingham Resolution—Embarrassment of the American Delegates—Their Protest against any Reference to Slavery—Exciting Discussion at the Conference—The Compromise adopted—Unsatisfactory and unsuccessful—Sorrow of the English and American Abolitionists—Letters from Mr. Whittier.

IN the year 1845, Mr. Sturge was called upon to sustain one of the severest afflictions that befel him in life. We have had occasion, in the preceding narrative, repeatedly to refer to his sister, Sophia Sturge. With the exception of the brief interval between his marriage and the death of his first wife, a period of rather less than a year, she had been his inseparable companion for nearly twenty-five years. From the concurrent testimony of those best acquainted with her, she appears to have been a woman of rare strength and excellence of character. In a short tribute to her memory which appeared in one of the Birmingham journals at the time of her death, from the pen, we believe, of the Rev. John Angell James, she is thus described:—

‘Never, perhaps, were the active and passive virtues of the Christian character more harmoniously and beautifully blended than in this most excellent woman. To a temper and disposition singularly sweet and engaging, she united a vigorous intellect and an understanding universally well informed. Her Christianity was vital and practical, diffusing its benign and heavenly influence throughout every action of her life—a life that was constantly devoted to the prosecution of some project of active benevolence and usefulness. She occupied and worthily filled a most important station as the colleague, counsellor, and ever-ready helper of her distinguished brother, in all his vast designs of beneficence. She not only presided in his family and relieved him of domestic cares, but she entered with earnest and enlightened interest into all his views, and by her intelligence and method greatly aided him in keeping himself informed of the progress of events in all their details. Her sound judgment and Christian wisdom were as a staff on which he could lean with assured confidence.’

Her affection for her brother, as she acknowledged on her death-bed, had something of idolatry in it. To say that she sympathised with him in all his public aspirations and efforts is to say little. She absolutely identified herself with him, and lived in his life. ‘He was the ocean to the river of her thoughts.’ She did this, however, not as a matter of mere passionate and unreasoning devotion to him personally. She had sufficient vigour of mind intelligently to appreciate his principles and plans, while her spirit, at once benevolent and devout, was so entirely in unison with his that all the ardour and energy of her life flowed naturally, as it were, into the channel of his existence. While he was walking in the perilous path of political excitement she watched over him with the trembling tenderness of a mother, fully approving, indeed, the course that he took, yet deeply anxious lest his spiritual character

should sustain detriment. Very touchingly do these feelings reveal themselves in some of her letters to her friend, Mr. Thomas Harvey, now before us :—

‘ I see,’ she says, ‘ the danger of my brother’s situation, and have often been visited with doubts whether he ought to be thus engaged ; but when I have been almost arriving at the conclusion that he should withdraw, some striking exhibition of the power with which he is enabled to meet one or another trying exigency, gives such evidence of the preserving tender care of his gracious Master, that knowing, as I do, his sincere desire to follow His guidance, I cannot believe that he is, or will be, left to the dictates of his own erring will I have an unshaken conviction that the cause is righteous, and whilst it is the reproach of all men there seems less to fear for its advocates—a season of popularity, should that ever arrive, would be the time of danger. I think Joseph is becoming less sensitive (I do not say hardened) by the reproach of his friends. I was delighted to meet his bright countenance in the lobby after Meeting last 4th day, after hearing a sermon which all must perceive was intended to reprove him.’

And again, when the storm of censure was at its highest, she writes :—

‘ As Richard Barrett remarked to me when he was here, Joseph is not *now* in danger from the praise of tongues. The approbation of a few thinking men seems for the present the only counterpoise to the asperities, persecutions, and indifference of other parties. But hard as the coldness, and sometimes bitterness, of friends are to bear, it is the needful preparation for *dangerous* service, and not to be spared by a tender Father, who “ chastens whom he loves ;” and the prayer of our heart is, that love and meekness may be granted in proportion to the accumulated load of calumny and reproach.’

It would be difficult to overrate the value to Mr.

Sturge of having such a counsellor in his own home, so intelligent and earnest in her sympathies with him, and yet so 'jealous over him with a godly jealousy,' lest he should err from the straight path of duty.

But this dear companion through so large a portion of the pilgrimage of life, he was now destined to lose. From the beginning of 1845 we find in his letters occasional references to the precarious state of his sister's health, which grow more and more frequent and anxious as the year advances. Early in May he writes thus to Mr. G. W. Alexander :—

'I am sorry to say that I cannot give an improved account of my dear sister's health. It is, however, an unspeakable favour that she can look forward to the probability of a fatal termination of her illness with that peaceful serenity and cheerfulness which a firm, but humble trust in the mercy of God in Christ Jesus can alone impart. I have pretty much resolved not to be from home for a night until I see the result of my sister's illness for life or for death, but if it is very important for me to be at the anti-slavery Meeting, I could come up and return the same evening.'

And a few weeks later, to the same friend :—

'I almost fear thou wilt think that I am hardly taking my share of anti-slavery burdens at this important time, but within the last fortnight my sister has several times been in such a state that I hardly knew, from one minute to another, whether she would survive; and while she is thus hanging between life and death, not only do I feel it my duty to remain with her, but my anxiety about her and the weakness of my spirits make me little qualified to do anything efficient when I am absent from her.'

Indeed, for many weeks he quitted her room as seldom as possible. As we have already seen, during those hours of precious but mournful communion in

the chamber of death, the brother and sister reviewed together the public and especially the political activities in which she had encouraged him to take part, and, amid many contrite acknowledgments of personal infirmity, felt that their motives and objects bore the scrutiny even of that searching and solemn hour. On the 6th of June the scene closed. In a letter to Mr. Tappan, under date of June 18, 1845, Mr. Sturge writes thus :—

‘MY DEAR FRIEND,—My previous letters would prepare thee for hearing that the spirit of my precious sister left its earthly tabernacle early on the morning of the 6th inst. After the message she sent to thee in my letter of the 16th of last month, thou mayest suppose that I must feel unshaken confidence that she was safely landed in the heavenly Canaan, even had the enemy been, through the increased weakness of her body, permitted afterwards to buffet her much more than he was. The last portion of Scripture read to her was, as she requested, a Psalm of thanksgiving and praise. The 30th was selected [*“I will extol Thee, O Lord; for Thou hast lifted me up, and hast not made my foes to rejoice over me,”* &c.] A few hours before her death she was partially delirious, and could say nothing of her spiritual state; but within about an hour of her death, in reply to a question of mine, she said, “Very comfortable.” These were the last words she ever uttered, and she passed off so gently that it would be difficult to say the precise time when death took place. From the time that I suspected danger from her illness, I felt it to be my duty, as well as high privilege, to make all other duties give way, that I might be in her sick-chamber, and I was rarely absent from her for many hours together, day or night, for some months before her death, and I hope little was omitted that could be done to mitigate her sufferings, and an examination, since her death, has also proved that no human skill could have arrested the disease. I have also the infinitely higher consolation of knowing from her own lips,

that while she viewed all her own works of righteousness as "filthy rags," she could rest in entire dependence on the mercy of her Saviour. Thou wilt justly say, "Why, then, mourn for her?" Yet I do mourn and weep, and, notwithstanding my many remaining undeserved mercies, the world appears, indeed, a wilderness without her. He who is touched with a feeling of our infirmities, and who wept at the grave of Lazarus, will, I trust, pity my weakness; and I am thankful to say, that hitherto I have been able to meet the shock with more composure than I dared to anticipate. I would gladly accept thy kind invitation, contained in thy letter of the 31st, were it right to do so, and there is hardly a human being, I believe, whom it would afford me more consolation to see and converse with; but even if it were right to leave my duties for such a journey, I feel deeply (and it is right I should) that this is a loss for which there is but one adequate relief—trying, through redeeming mercy, to get my own house in order, that when the message of death comes, I may be permitted to follow where she is gone. She wished me to send thee a token of her remembrance; what shall it be? Instead of two, please send me six copies of "The Interior Life," by Upham. Next to the Bible, I believe, it was the greatest consolation to Sophia. I hope I feel as strongly bound to the anti-slavery cause as ever, but I must write of this in my next.

‘Very affectionately thy friend,

‘JOSEPH STURGE.’

Mr. Sturge probably felt the loss of his sister more keenly and profoundly than any affliction that he had ever encountered in life. Dark, indeed, must have been his dwelling-place when the light shed upon it by that bright and congenial spirit was withdrawn. Providence, however, was gracious to him again. After an interval of about eighteen months of this domestic desolation, his home was once more made glad by womanly affection and sympathy. On October 14,

1846, he was married to Hannah, youngest daughter of Mr. Barnard Dickinson, of Coalbrookdale. We cannot better close this brief notice of Sophia Sturge than by introducing the following beautiful lines from the pen of Mr. Whittier, entitled,

‘TO MY FRIEND, ON THE DEATH OF HIS SISTER.

‘Thine is a grief, the depth of which another
May never know;
Yet, o’er the waters, Oh my stricken brother!
To thee I go.

‘I lean my heart unto thee, sadly folding
Thy hand in mine;
With even the weakness of my soul upholding
The strength of thine.

‘I never knew, like thee, the dear departed;
I stood not by
When, in calm trust, the pure and tranquil-hearted
Lay down to die.

‘And on thy ears my words of weak condoling
Must vainly fall;
The funeral bell which in thy heart is tolling
Sounds over all!

‘I will not mock thee with the poor world’s common
And heartless phrase,
Nor wrong the memory of a sainted woman
With idle praise.

‘With silence only as their benediction
God’s angels come
Where, in the shadow of a great affliction,
The soul sits dumb!

‘Yet would I say what thy own heart approveth:
Our Father’s will—
Calling to Him the dear one whom He loveth—
Is mercy still.

‘Not upon thee or thine the solemn angel
Hath evil wrought;
Her funeral anthem is a glad evangel—
The good die not!

'God calls our loved ones; but we lose not wholly
What He hath given!
They live on earth, in thought and deed, as truly
As in His heaven.

'And she is with thee; in thy path of trial
She walketh yet;
Still with the baptism of thy self-denial
Her locks are wet.

'Up, then, my brother! lo, the fields of harvest
Lie white in view!
She lives, and loves thee, and the God thou servest
To both is true.

'Thrust in thy sickle! England's toil-worn peasants
Thy call abide;
And she thou mourn'st, a pure and holy presence,
Shall glean beside!'

The memory of such a sister, we may well believe, when he had once recovered from the first shock of grief, far from paralysing his energies, must rather have animated him more than ever to 'patient continuance in well-doing.' Accordingly, we find that not long did he 'sit in the shadow of that great affliction.' In a few months he is again at his post, vigilant, alert, resolute in what he deemed the cause of truth and righteousness on the earth.

The proceedings of the Evangelical Alliance, a body which was constituted in 1846 with a view to promote and express greater visible union between the various bodies of Evangelical Christians in this and all other Protestant countries, engaged Mr. Sturge's attention in a considerable degree. The object in itself was one adapted strongly to attract the sympathies of a nature so liberal and loving as his. But when he came to examine more narrowly the constitution of the proposed alliance, it seemed to him that the good men who were promoting it had fallen into the error with which a certain body of ecclesiastics have been charged, and to

which perhaps all bodies of ecclesiastics are more or less a little prone—a disposition ‘to lengthen the creeds, and to shorten the commandments.’ This was painfully apparent when comparing the stringency of their doctrinal with the laxity of their moral test. The former was so stringent that no member of the Society of Friends could be admitted, and the latter was so lax that no trafficker in the bodies and souls of our fellow-men need be excluded. On both these points Mr. Sturge felt that he was called upon to make his protest. As respects the creed, which those who should become members were expected to subscribe, it appeared to him that for a union which avowedly professed to include *all evangelical* Christians, the basis adopted was so narrow as to be not only inconsistent with that profession, but to involve something very like a breach of Christian charity. With regard, indeed, to the particular article on which he animadverts below, it looked at first sight as if it had been adopted expressly with a view to shut out the Society of Friends, seeing that they are the only body that questions the validity of the dogmas it affirms. He felt it his duty, therefore, to address a public letter on the subject to his friend and neighbour, the Rev. John Angell James, who, if not the founder of the Alliance, was one of its most earnest and influential supporters. In this document he asked his friend ‘candidly to reconsider the following article, which it had been announced was unanimously adopted by the Alliance as one of the articles of belief which all parties must hold who shall be considered worthy to take any part in their future proceedings: “The Divine institution of the Christian ministry, and the authority and perpetuity of the ordinances of Baptism and the Lord’s Supper.”’

‘This resolution,’ continues Mr. Sturge, ‘immediately follows one, passed on the same occasion, affirming “The right and duty of private judgment in the interpretation of Holy Scripture.” In the exercise of this right it is well known that many persons, after prayerful and earnest examination and enquiry, have arrived at the conclusion that the “authority and perpetuity” of what are called the ordinances of Baptism and the Lord’s Supper are not enjoined by Holy Scripture; and also believe it to be their duty to refrain from the adoption of them in their own practice.

‘The grounds for bearing a testimony against the observance of these ordinances were probably never stronger than at the present day, from the undue importance attached to them by some, and the presumptuous confidence in their own salvation evinced by others, who, while holding these ordinances to be essential, and relying upon their efficacy, prove by their spirit and their conduct that they do not belong to the fold of Christ.

‘It has been rumoured that this public avowal that the outward ceremony of Baptism and the Lord’s Supper are indispensable to Christian union on the part of those who are associated for the express object of *extending* its basis, was conceded against their judgment by some who were present on the occasion, partly in deference to the wishes of their less tolerant coadjutors, and partly in consequence of a statement that if this resolution were not passed, there were other reasons why those who would be excluded by it could not join the Evangelical Alliance.

‘It is probable that such is the case, and also that none who are thus excluded have any desire to become its members; but surely this can be no justification of a resolution at variance with the one recognising the right of private judgment in the interpretation of Scripture, and with that charity which the Association professes to be so desirous of promoting.

‘These remarks are not offered with an unfriendly feeling, or with any desire to cast the least reflection upon those who deem it their duty to be baptized with water, and to take the bread and wine in the manner established by the different denominations to which they belong, but with high respect

and personal regard towards many of those who are taking part in promoting the proposed Evangelical Alliance, and who, it seems to me, would be acting at variance with that charity which has often been exemplified in their conduct, if they now affirm, even by implication, that none amongst their fellow-probationers on earth belong to the true Church, because they have never been baptized with water or partaken of the bread and wine of the communion table. These will also probably admit that the instances are not few of those who are now removed to their eternal home who, though they had in the near prospect of death no shade of doubt as to the propriety of their abstaining from these outward observances, could yet rest in unshaken confidence on the mercy and mediation of their Saviour, and who have given indubitable evidence that, while they viewed their own works of righteousness but as "filthy rags," they had "washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb."

'If this be true, should not all who have the Spirit of Christ pause before they exclude from fellowship with the Church militant on earth any whom He will judge worthy at the final tribunal—towards which we are all hastening—to form part of the Church triumphant in heaven?

'I am, very respectfully,

'JOSEPH STURGE.

'To John Angell James.'

Mr. James wrote a very kind but hardly a satisfactory answer to his friend's remonstrance:—

'MY DEAR SIR,—I have been so entirely absorbed by business since the receipt of your note that I really had no time to reply to it, or to consider the printed address it was intended to introduce to my attention, and I can now only assure you with great brevity, that it is quite impossible for me to feel in the smallest degree offended by your thus publicly calling my attention to one of the articles of the Evangelical Alliance.

'You may be quite sure from what you know not only of

me, but of the whole conference which passed that article, that it was not intended to treat with disesteem the body of professing Christians to which you belong. We know you too well and love you too much for this. That it is individually exclusive as regards your friends is true, but that it is not *intentionally* exclusive is no less true; and it is considered that it is not the only thing which would prevent your joining with us. It will be in your recollection that you admitted to me, that had not this article been inserted, there were other matters which would have kept you from joining the Alliance. Our object was to secure as many denominations, or rather the members of them, as would cooperate upon a common basis. Now as we could not, without this, secure you, and we could, by inserting it, secure others, it was thought by the majority that we could not dispense with it; and to ensure unanimity many of us gave up our wishes, which was the more readily done as we by no means intended by those articles to draw a line of Christian brotherhood.

‘Yours most truly,

‘J. A. JAMES.’

As regards slavery, Mr. Sturge felt that as American Christians were invited to join the Alliance, the mode in which that body dealt with the question was really a matter of very urgent practical importance. It had long been felt that the Church in America, in some cases by its open defence, in others by its guilty silence, and in almost all by its feeble testimony respecting the evil thing, formed really the bulwark of slavery. If, therefore, English Christians welcomed its ministers and members into the closest communion with them, asking no questions for conscience’ sake, they would be regarded on both sides of the Atlantic as virtually condoning the offence of those implicated in the guilt of slavery, and constructively sanctioning the institution itself. As soon, therefore, as it became known that the

Alliance had sent, or were about to send, invitations to Americans to attend its first World's Convention, to be holden in London in August 1846, the Anti-slavery Society addressed a very able memorial to the committee of the Alliance, in which, after vividly depicting the fearful cruelties and immoralities of the slave system as existing in the United States, and the deplorable extent to which it was vindicated and sustained by large bodies of professing Christians in that country, 'who would feel no difficulty in subscribing the Alliance's confession of faith,' they besought the committee not to invite such men to their association, but rather, in the spirit of Christian fidelity, to refuse to receive into their fellowship all, be their pretensions what they may, who either directly participated or acquiesced in the guilt of upholding or defending the enslavement of their fellow-men. This was backed up by all the personal influence which Mr. Sturge could bring to bear upon the members of the committee. The result was, that at a meeting of the committee of the Alliance, held at Birmingham, March 31, 1846, it was resolved 'that invitations ought not to be sent to individuals who, whether by their own fault or otherwise, may be in the unhappy position of holding their fellow-men as slaves.' Mr. Sturge, in writing to Mr. Lewis Tappan under date of April 31, 1846, adverts to this decision:—

'Thou wilt see in the Anti-slavery "Reporter" of this month a letter from the British and Foreign Anti-slavery Society to the London committee of the Evangelical Alliance on the subject of inviting slaveholders to their general convention in August next, and thou wilt be pleased to hear that at a meeting of their deputies held here this week, after about four hours' discussion, they came to the unanimous conclusion that they should not be invited. Though the resolution is not

worded in a manner that is quite satisfactory to me, had I been a party to it, yet the substance is there. Would it not be well to get your religious newspapers to publish our letter with the fact of this decision, and invite our friends to furnish the names of any parties coming to the Alliance who are members of churches that hold any joint property in slaves, or who are pastors of churches that have slaveholding members, or who, either in their sermons or writings, have defended the system, &c.?’

Unhappily, however, the invitation had been sent out before the Birmingham resolution was adopted, and in such a form as made the doctrinal creed the only term of membership, without any reference whatever to slavery. Many of the American delegates had been appointed, and some of them had actually sailed for England, before this supplementary condition reached them. It does not appear that, with one exception, any of them were personally implicated in slave-holding; but as most, if not all of them, were in Christian fellowship with Southern churches which allowed and vindicated the practice, they were not the less embarrassed and aggrieved. When the Alliance met, they made a strong protest against the question of slavery being introduced at all. The American church was represented by some of its most able and distinguished men, including such names as Dr. Beecher, Dr. Cox, Dr. Patton, Dr. Skinner, Dr. Baird, Dr. Emery, Dr. Mason, Rev. E. N. Kirk, Rev. Mr. Pomeroy, &c. When, however, it was found that the subject could not be evaded, the convention, after a long and very exciting discussion, which at one time almost threatened to wreck the whole confederation, adopted a resolution, in which they ‘expressed their confidence that no branch will admit to membership slaveholders who, *by their own fault,*

continue in that position, retaining their fellow-men in slavery, *from regard to their own interests.*' This was felt by many of the English members to be a most equivocal and unsatisfactory conclusion, leaving loopholes through which consciences less unscrupulous than those of most slaveholders would find no difficulty in escaping. But vague and vapid as it was, it was too much for the American delegates. For though they had at first given it a sort of *quasi*-adhesion for the sake of union, yet afterwards, when they came to consider its effect at home, a large number of them felt called upon to reopen the question by a written reclamation addressed to the conference, in which they complained, as indeed they had a just right to do, that the Birmingham resolution had been adopted and sent to them after they had been appointed as delegates under the former conditions, which contained no allusion to slavery. But they did more than this. They condemned the substance of the resolution itself, on the ground, among others, 'that it would exclude from the Alliance not only Christian slaveholders, but the great body of evangelical Christians in the non-slaveholding States of America who are in Christian communion with them.' Far from acquiescing in the idea of non-fellowship with slaveowners, 'our duty,' they said, 'no less than our Christian affection, impels us to maintain intimate relations with them, and we could not, without a grievous offence against the best hopes of religion and humanity in the South, as well as against our own consciences, consent to any action which would imply a want of Christian confidence in them, or which might endanger our amicable and fraternal relations with this portion of the American church.' This led to another stormy debate, which

ended in the Alliance *rescinding* their previous resolution, and 'recommending the members of the Alliance to adopt such organisation in their several countries as in their judgment may be most in accordance with their peculiar circumstances without involving the responsibility of one part of the Alliance for another,' while the final and complete organisation of the *general* Alliance was to be deferred to another conference. This was, surely, a most lame and impotent conclusion, and deeply disappointed and grieved Mr. Sturge and his anti-slavery friends. 'Thou wilt see by the papers,' he says, in writing to Mr. Whittier, 'what a mess the Evangelical Alliance has made of the slavery question, and I fear upon the whole they have done it great harm.' When we remember that men like Dr. Wardlaw, Mr. Angell James, and others, who had through life signalised themselves as the uncompromising enemies of slavery, approved of the course thus taken, we dare not say that the cause of the slave was wilfully betrayed. But there cannot be a doubt that in America, where the action of the conference was watched with the utmost interest, the timidity, vacillation, and final resilience of the Alliance before the face of slavery, was regarded as a heavy blow and a great discouragement by those who in that country were bearing the brunt of the anti-slavery battle. Mr. Whittier was never esteemed a violent man, but the unwonted severity of language he employs in commenting on the proceedings of the Alliance shows how deep was in his estimation the injury they had inflicted on the cause to which he was so earnestly devoted. Writing to his friend, Sept. 27, 1846, he says:—

'I see your Evangelical Alliance has shipwrecked itself on the slavery question. Why is it that humanity and orthodoxy

must needs be divorced from each other? I think I should as soon unite myself with Popery as with a Protestant alliance of slaveholders and pro-slavery preachers? When will men learn that there *can* be "no compromise" between right and wrong?'

Again, a month later, he refers to the question :—

'For me,' he says, 'I do not see that your preachers and ministers in England and Scotland are one whit more abolitionised than their brethren on this side the water. The exhibition which they made of themselves in the Evangelical Alliance has satisfied me that, if they should take up their residence in Slave States, nine in ten of them would in five years either become slaveholders or open defenders of slavery. This is my deliberately-formed opinion; I should rejoice to be able to think otherwise.'

We must pardon something to the spirit of liberty. We think Mr. Whittier would not have said this had he known more intimately many of the men who, in a moment of weakness, had allowed themselves to be seduced into the unhappy compromise of which he complains. But surely this vehemence of speech may well be excused to a man who was smarting under the consciousness that he, and those associated with him in the arduous enterprise that absorbed their whole hearts, had thus been unexpectedly wounded in what they had hoped would be the house of their friends.

As is generally the case, the object which was supposed to justify the compromise was wholly missed. The Americans, from that time forth, withdrew from the general Alliance, and in their own branch peremptorily rejected the term of fellowship suggested by the Birmingham resolution. Under date of June 6, 1847, Mr. Whittier again writes to Mr. Sturge :—

‘The American branch of the Evangelical Alliance has refused to exclude slaveholders. There never was a more foolish and wicked compromise with villany than that of the ministers of Great Britain in this matter. They have done more mischief to practical Christianity by that act than they would repair were their lives prolonged a century, and crowded with good works. Let them repent deeply, heartily, if they would save their evangelical Protestantism from the contempt of the world.’

It is but justice to the British branch of the Alliance to say that, as soon as the disturbing element was withdrawn, they made ample amends for their former ambiguous conduct. At their first meeting, we believe, after the general conference, they agreed, by an almost unanimous vote, ‘upon mature deliberation on the whole case, without pronouncing any judgment on the personal Christianity of slaveholders, to declare that no holder of a slave shall be deemed eligible to membership in their body.’

CHAPTER XVIII.

THE FREE LABOUR MOVEMENT.

The Cotton Manufacture of England the great Support of American Slavery—Superiority of Free over Slave Labour—Mr. John Sturge's Paper on this Subject—Fund for procuring Free Labour Goods—Letters to Mr. G.W. Alexander, Mr. Samuel Rhoades, and Mr. Tappan—Appeal to the Friends of Abolition—New Impulse given to the Question by Mrs. Stowe's Visit—'Uncle Tom's Cabin'—Mr. and Mrs. Stowe at Birmingham—Mr. Sturge enlists them in the Free Labour Movement—Letter to them—Tries to connect Free Labour with India Reform—Letter to Mr. Bright—Exertions of Mr. Elihu Burritt—Spirit of Trade too strong for Philanthropy—Mr. Sturge's personal Abstinence from whatever was tainted with Slavery.

EARLY in the year 1845 we find Mr. Sturge busily engaged in promoting what was called the Free Labour Movement. It was impossible for those who had taken an active part in the anti-slavery agitation not to feel, what was constantly pressed upon their attention by friends and foes, how greatly our enormous consumption of cotton in this country contributed to the maintenance and extension of slavery in America. Very little reflection and enquiry was sufficient to show that the great Upas-tree, fruitful of so much oppression and misery to the black race, which was spreading its branches more and more widely over the western continent, had its tap-root in Lancashire and Yorkshire. The consciousness of this impelled Mr. Sturge and his fellow-labourers to make an effort to place within reach of the people of England articles manufactured out of

cotton raised by free labour. They hoped by this means not only to relieve their own consciences from indirect complicity with a system they abhorred, but so to encourage the cultivation of free cotton as to make it a formidable competitor in the market to that grown out of the blood and tears of the negro, and thus ultimately prove what, indeed, was a part of their case, that, other things being equal, free labour was cheaper and more productive than slave labour.

A paper on this subject, distinguished by rare ability and research, had been presented to the Anti-slavery Convention of 1840 by his brother, Mr. John Sturge, in which, by an elaborate collation of facts derived not only from our colonies and the United States, but from Russia, Poland, Hungary, and wherever an opportunity existed of comparing free and slave labour, he had shown the great superiority of the former over the latter. After giving his long array of testimonies, he observes :—

‘No one, we think, can avoid being struck with the surprising coincidence which exists between all the facts we have cited, although occurring under very different circumstances, and in situations widely distant from each other; or fail to acknowledge that they are sufficient to establish in the clearest and most convincing manner the important principle for which we are contending.’

But the great difficulty was, under the actual circumstances in this country, to bring the produce of free labour into the market on such conditions as would give it a fair chance of competing on equal terms with its rival. Mr. Sturge, therefore, induced a number of his leading anti-slavery friends to join with him in raising a small fund with which to make an experiment in this direction. The leading contributors to this

fund, as to every other connected with the anti-slavery cause, are the old names—Samuel Gurney, Joseph John Gurney, George Thomas, Joseph Eaton, Joseph T. Price, G. W. Alexander, &c., together, of course, with Mr. Sturge's own and his brother's. But the duty of collecting the money seems, as was pretty generally the case, to have principally devolved upon him, as we gather from letters to Mr. Alexander written about this time:—

‘I have this morning received the note of S. Gurney forwarded at thy request, agreeing to give 100*l.* towards our free cotton experiment. I have also a letter from Joseph Eaton this morning, by which I understand him to be willing to find 50*l.*’

And at a later date:—

‘I am pleased to inform thee that our friend George Thomas has consented to give 50*l.* towards our free-labour stock, and my brother Charles will guarantee either 50*l.* or 70*l.* to make up the 500*l.*’

Their first object, of course, was to procure a supply of bonâ fide free-labour cotton; next to get manufacturers in whose integrity they could confide to work it up into various articles of clothing and other consumption; and then to secure agents and retail dealers in various parts of the country who should feel sufficient interest in the subject to keep the articles as a part of their stock, and bring them under the attention of their customers. Their expectation was, that though in the first instance the price of such articles might be somewhat higher than that of those produced in the ordinary method, yet as the demand for them increased they could be furnished at equal if not lower rates, while in the meantime the existence of such a class of goods would serve as a perpetual remembrancer to the public

conscience, and enable those who were earnest in the cause to present a sort of daily practical protest against all encouragement of slavery. Mr. Sturge entered upon this work with his wonted ardour, and prosecuted it with his wonted perseverance. In conjunction with his friend Mr. G. W. Alexander, then earnestly devoted to the anti-slavery cause, he visited many parts of England to explain this new method of operation and enlist the public sympathies on its behalf. Writing to this gentleman in Nov. 1845, he says:—

‘A letter I have from Manchester gives me reason to expect that we may have some of Crewdson’s and another manufacturer’s actually ready to offer within a fortnight from this time. . . . We have had much encouragement in our journey; all appear to approve of this cotton plan. At Bristol there were probably not less than 1,200 people present, including a large proportion of those it was important to interest; and at Devonport and Tavistock the meetings were very crowded. At Plymouth it was held at 12 o’clock, and was less numerous and more select.’

Under a later date he thus cheers his coadjutor, who appears to have had some misgivings:—

‘I am obliged by thy letter, and though no doubt the difficulties are many in the way of a proper supply of free-labour cotton articles, yet, if we set about it in earnest, I think, or at least hope, that they will not be found quite so great as thou latterly seems to suppose. I think I shall go down to see Wilson Crewdson about it shortly, and shall of course let thee know the result.’

He corresponded largely, also, with friends in America on the subject. Mr. Samuel Rhoades, of Philadelphia, writes to him in Nov. 1845:—

‘We are labouring in the free-trade produce cheerfully, and hope to engage in the manufacture of cotton soon. We are surprised to find we can obtain large quantities of this

description in Georgia, Alabama, and Mississippi.* What will some of your manufacturing friends think of making an arrangement with us to furnish them with free cotton direct from the plantations? I want to see a strong movement in England on this subject, especially among Friends—let them lead the way, as they *should*?

His own letters to Mr. Lewis Tappan about this time abound with allusions to the free-labour question. Thus, under date of March 1846, he writes :—

‘I have ordered to be sent to thee, by the first sailing packet, five pieces of white calico, and one of each of five printed ones, all made of free-labour cotton, as by patterns enclosed. Please let Samuel Rhoades of Philadelphia have a part of them, if he wishes. Anything thou lovest by them on the invoice price, please to place to my debit.’

Again, in May of the same year :—

‘I wrote a few lines to thee to enquire what is the duty upon such cotton as I have forwarded to thee; also, what would be the duty on dresses made up, as I have an idea of encouraging some of our friends here to send a supply of articles of free-labour cotton to the proposed Philadelphia bazaar. . . . There are 250 bales of cotton arrived from one of the Company’s experimental farms in the East Indies, and I hope to get the samples from Liverpool in a day or two.’

In the beginning of 1846, the preliminary arrangements having been sufficiently matured, an address was issued ‘To the Friends of the Abolition of the Slave-Trade and Slavery,’ signed by Joseph J. Gurney, George Thomas, Joseph Eaton, Joseph Sturge, and G. W. Alexander, calling attention to the movement. A short extract from this document will explain the views of its promoters :—

* From Mr. Olmsted’s works, it appears that before the outbreak of the civil war, one-tenth at least of the cotton of the United States was grown by free-labour.

'We have already stated, in concurrence with the testimony of some of the most eminent friends of the slaves in the United States, and undeniable facts, that the demand for the cotton of that country in Great Britain has been a chief means of perpetuating and extending slavery in America. Shortly after the declaration of American independence, there was much ground to hope that slavery would not long exist in the Union. The tide of public opinion, which had already led to acts for the abolition of slavery in several of the Northern States, was directed with considerable force against it; there were at that time few articles of export produced by slaves in the States of great pecuniary value. In 1790, the number of slaves was 657,000, and the cotton exported 189,000 lbs. In 1843, the number of slaves was estimated at 2,847,810; the cotton exported was 1,081,919,000 lbs.; and unless the most vigorous means be used to stay this mighty evil, it is impossible to calculate what may be its future extension. Shall we, then, continue to uphold and furnish an inducement for the maintenance of this vast system of crime and misery which we profess to deplore and abhor? Humanity, justice, and religion forbid us to do so; and we therefore confidently cherish the hope that, as one means of discountenancing slavery, many of our countrymen and countrywomen will now be found willing and determined, as far as in them lies, to relinquish the use of American slave-grown cotton. . . . We are glad to be able to inform those into whose hands this may fall, that an attempt is being made in this country to obtain a supply of articles manufactured exclusively from cotton the produce of free labour. It has been ascertained that some highly respectable manufacturers are willing to aid in carrying out the wishes of some friends of the anti-slavery cause in this country in making such an article, which will be distinguished by a mark to show its genuineness. In the first instance, the number of articles will be small; but if encouragement be given to the attempt, a greater variety will hereafter be manufactured and offered for sale.'

Mr. Sturge continued to sustain this movement for many years, and expended upon it a good deal of time, labour, and money. The visit of Mr. and Mrs. Stowe into this country, and the general interest excited on behalf of the anti-slavery cause by the extraordinary success of 'Uncle Tom's Cabin,' gave, for a while, a fresh impulse to the free-labour movement; and it was hoped that the public generally might be induced to make some sacrifice and to take some little trouble to give practical expression to the sympathies for the slaves which had been so widely awakened. We can readily understand the cordial pleasure with which Mr. Sturge welcomed the appearance of that remarkable book. Writing to Mr. Tappan, who had first called his attention to it, he says:—

'I have read "Uncle Tom" since I wrote to thee, and think it deserves all the praise that has been bestowed upon it. . . . No common head or heart could have composed such a work, even with an intimate knowledge of the effects of slavery upon the character both of the owners and the slaves. It evinces no small knowledge both of human nature and Christian experience, to delineate, as the writer has done, some of the prominent characters. It is indeed a great thing to get such a work generally read with you both North and South, and I am not without hopes that it may do more to produce a change in public opinion among you than anything that has yet occurred. . . . It would be an interesting and glorious fact if a female pen should be made the instrument of overthrowing the monster Slavery in your land.'

When Mrs. Stowe visited England, Joseph Sturge's house became naturally one of her homes. When, therefore, she had been nearly lionised to death by the good people of Scotland, Dr. Stowe, with a wise instinct where to find what he wanted, applied to him to afford

them a few days' quiet retreat at Edgbaston, where they might rest and recover their strength. In her 'Sunny Memories,' Mrs. Stowe remarks upon what so many besides have felt, the kind of unworldly calm which reigned in that happy circle :—

'The grounds of Mr. Sturge,' she says, describing a Sunday she spent there, 'are very near to those of his brother, only a narrow road interposing between them. They have contrived to make them one by building under this road a subterranean passage, so that the two families can pass and repass into each other's grounds in perfect privacy. At noon we dined at the house of the other brother, Mr. Edmund Sturge. . . . We enjoyed our quiet season with those two families exceedingly. We seemed to feel ourselves in an atmosphere where all was peace and goodwill to men. The little children, after dinner, took us through the walks to show us their beautiful rabbits and other pets. Everything seemed orderly, peaceable, quiet. . . . My Sunday here has always seemed to me a pleasant kind of pastoral, much like the communion of Christian and Faithful on the Delectable Mountains.'

We need hardly say that Mr. Sturge was one of those who delighted to honour this eminent lady ; but he was not satisfied that the effects of her visit should evaporate in mere demonstrations of popular feeling, but wished that they should be turned to some account in furthering the great cause to which she had already rendered such distinguished services. He was deeply anxious, therefore, to enlist her interest and that of her husband in the free-labour question. Writing to Mr. Tappan, under date of May 5, 1853, he says :—

'I received a note from Professor Stowe from Edinburgh last week, in which he said they were completely worn-out and exhausted, and asking me "for the sake of Christ and

humanity" to receive them privately, as they were intending to come to my house on the Thursday evening, with the hope of getting a little rest. They stayed with me, including a visit to Stratford, Warwick, and Kenilworth, in which I accompanied them, from that evening until Monday, which afforded me the full opportunity I wanted to go into the questions of immediate emancipation, compensation to slave-owners, and the disuse of slave-grown produce; and I am glad to say that it resulted in a full unity of view on the latter subject. . . . Her husband and brother are also heartily with us, and the former intends to make a speech on the subject at the Exeter Hall Meeting on the 16th. I think if the abolitionists on both sides the water can cordially unite on this point, something effectual may be done.'

Mr. Sturge had a considerable correspondence with Mr. and Mrs. Stowe on this question after their return to America. In one of her letters Mrs. Stowe says:—

'Since I wrote last, Henry Miles, a member of the Society of Friends, has called upon me and communicated a good many encouraging facts with regard to a free-labour movement in America. I feel quite encouraged to hope that a way is opening in which something efficient can be done.'

To which Mr. Sturge replies, addressing Professor and Mrs. Stowe, November 25, 1853:—

'Your welcome letters to Hannah and myself have both come to hand by the same packet, and we are cheered to hear of the progress of the free-labour question in the minds of abolitionists. I have this week been in Lancashire chiefly in relation to this subject, and last night attended a public meeting at Manchester, the chief objects of which were, first to endeavour to influence your Christian Churches in the right direction on the anti-slavery question, and secondly, to encourage the consumption of free-labour in preference to slave-labour produce. On the latter point I read some short extracts from your letter. The feeling appeared almost

unanimous, that we must look chiefly to British India for our supply of free-grown cotton; and at a select meeting the night before, at which John Bright was present, the main point considered was, how we could most effectually influence those who control the government of that vast country, so as to secure the cheap production of sugar and cotton. Now that the abolitionists of America are alive to this subject, I beg to suggest that some of your manufacturers who are favourable to the object should be encouraged to make things on the spot from free-labour cotton, instead of getting them from England as they do now, since the carriage of the cotton from America, and of the goods back again, as well as the thirty per cent. duty, would thus be saved, and the risk of deception lessened. I believe there is quite as much difficulty in getting the manufacturers to make them here as with you, while the moral influence of such a manufacture with you would be greater upon the South, I should suppose, than with us.'

Mr. Sturge also endeavoured, as will be seen from the above letter, to engraft this free-labour idea on the India Reform movement, which a body of able and earnest men, headed by Mr. Bright, were striving to promote in and out of Parliament. The following communication to Mr. Bright, dated November 5, 1853, refers to this, and no doubt led to the meeting at Manchester described in the preceding letter:—

'Birmingham: 11 mo. 9, 1853.

MY DEAR FRIEND,—I have been for some time strongly of opinion that the abolitionists of this country should very much concentrate their efforts upon the encouragement of the cheap production and the improvement of the quality by free labour of the articles now largely cultivated by slaves, especially cotton, sugar, and rice; and the view thou took in a letter which I received from thee last summer on the East India question, was so entirely in harmony with my own, that I have been wishing for a suitable opportunity of more

fully going into the question of how far those who are willing to work mainly on anti-slavery grounds can cooperate and aid in the efforts of your India Reform Society. There is no doubt that the attention you have called to the misgovernment of British India has been of very great importance, and that whoever may have the control of that department in future will be disposed to meet the views of any considerable party in this country, who were united for encouraging the extended and improved cultivation and the facilities of transit of the great staples of India. I have partly engaged to go to Manchester ere long, to talk over, with a few practical manufacturers, the best means of increasing the supply of free-labour cotton; and if anything were likely to call thee there shortly, or thou couldst come over to Manchester for a few hours, I would try to make my time suit thine. I have to-day received a private circular (which I presume thou hast seen) from George Buist, of the "Bombay Times," proposing to give lectures on India, here and elsewhere. It is accompanied by a note of introduction from H. D. Seymour. I fear there is so little interest here on the subject, that scarcely any but a great lion like thyself would secure a respectable audience.

'Affectionately thy friend,

'JOS. STURGE.'

Mr. Elihu Burritt, also, threw all the fervour of his spirit into the same cause, and issued some very able papers, tending to show how rapidly and vitally abstinence from slave-labour produce on the part of the British public would affect the institution of slavery in America. 'If,' he says, in one of his papers, 'there were a movement set on foot in Great Britain which would, in the view of the slaveholders, close the British market against their productions at the end of ten years if they persisted in adhering to their system up to that time, they would doubtless emancipate their slaves immediately, and adopt the system of free labour. For

they would not risk the loss of the British market for any consideration which the existence of slavery could supply. The same would be true of the slaveholders of Brazil and Cuba.' Nor did these zealous labourers in the cause of freedom fail to appeal to the manufacturers on the ground of self-interest, where they were not accessible on the plea of philanthropy, by pointing out to them how hazardous it was to depend upon one country for the supply of an article of such immense importance as cotton, which might be suddenly cut off by a failure of the crop, or a war between the two nations. It is impossible now not to reflect, that if these efforts and appeals had been effectual—if the manufacturers of Lancashire on the one hand, and the people of England on the other, had given timely heed to the warnings and exhortations then addressed to them—the terrible calamity which has been since the occasion of so much suffering and crime might have been averted. But the voice was as of one crying in the wilderness. Comparatively few cared to listen to it, and of those who did, the majority treated it with the ready scorn with which the world is apt to treat all ideas which aspire to look beyond its own narrow purview. The spirit of trade was then, as it ever is, deaf to the pleadings of justice and humanity, and, obedient only to its own hard laws and sordid interests, drove its car onward with a roll inexorable as fate, reckless of who or what might be crushed beneath its Juggernaut wheels. And the good people of England, with the tears in their eyes from reading 'Uncle Tom's Cabin,' found it pleasanter to express their love for freedom, their sympathy for the slave, and their hatred of oppression, by denunciations and remonstrances addressed to sinners in America, than by making any serious efforts

or sacrifice to clear themselves of complicity in the sin at home.

At any rate Mr. Sturge left no means untried to keep his own conscience clear in the matter. In his household nothing was allowed which, so far as he knew, bore on it any taint of slavery. The extent to which he carried his abhorrence of the unclean thing, and his determination not to touch it, if possible, by however remote a relation, is strikingly indicated in the following extract from a letter which he wrote to Mr. Lewis Tappan, under date of September 3, 1846 :—

‘As we are defeated in our attempt to get any legislative interference with slave-grown produce, it does not lessen, but perhaps increase, our obligation to be particular about touching it in our individual capacity, or in our mercantile transactions. I am anxious to be as clear of it as possible. In consequence of the free-trade measures of this country, it is likely we shall have considerable transactions with the United States in grain and flour, and, if we wish it, with some of your slave States, especially Baltimore and New Orleans. Now, I not only am desirous, as a matter of principle, but I believe the effort would be very beneficial, not to transact business with those who employ slaves in any branch of their establishment, or in putting the goods on board ship. I wish thee to give me thy opinion both as to whether this would be practicable, and, if so, whether, in either or both these places, or any other slave port which ships corn and flour, thou could name a party well acquainted with our business who could be certainly depended upon to execute commissions, and to employ none but free men in their establishment, or in shipping the goods. If thou canst not, I should be obliged by any suggestion from thee as to the best mode of carrying out the object I have just named. As so much of the corn and flour which is shipped in the slave States comes from those which are free, I do not feel at all called upon to enquire further than whether those we

actually commission to act on our behalf are free from the system.'

If it be said that this was to enquire too curiously, and that any attempt to follow trade transactions into all the remote and possible relations of a questionable nature by which they may be effected would paralyse all the business of life, be it so. It is something, at least, to find a man consistently *trying* to carry his conscience with him into his commerce. If Mr. Sturge has by so doing given a dangerous example, there is small fear of the contagion spreading very widely. A too fastidious commercial morality is not likely to become the besetting sin of this generation.

CHAPTER XIX.

ENGLAND AND AMERICA—FRENCH REVOLUTION— ANTI-PAPAL AGITATION.

Disturbed Relations between England and America—The Maine Boundary Question—Mr. Sturge's Anxiety and Exertions—Lord Ashburton's Settlement—Letter from Mr. Tappan—The Oregon Difficulty—Great Excitement in America—International Addresses—Mr. Sturge's Activity in promoting them—Their good Effect—Letters from Mr. Whittier and Mr. Tappan—The Militia Bill—Successful Opposition to it—Letter from Mr. Douglas Jerrold—The French Revolution of 1848—Deputation to the Provisional Government—Abolition of Slavery in the French Colonies—Mr. Sturge's Interview with M. Arago and M. Schœlcher—Presentation of Address to Provisional Government—Religious Liberty—The Pope's Rescript—Great Excitement it occasioned—Meeting called at Birmingham—Mr. Sturge's Address to his Fellow-Townsmen—Moves an Amendment at the Meeting—The Result.

It will be readily understood how, with the intimate relations existing between him and many dear friends in America with whom he was working together for the common interests of humanity, any appearance of war between the two countries filled his mind with peculiar horror. On more than one occasion, however, this calamity seemed imminent. On the accession of the Conservative Government, in 1841, they found left on their hands by their predecessors an American difficulty of a very formidable nature, that relating to the Maine boundary, the discussion of which had produced great acerbity of feeling between the two Governments. Mr. Sturge had then just returned from America and the acquaintance he had formed with many

men like-minded with himself in that country enabled him to promote something like concerted action between the friends of peace on both sides of the Atlantic, in their efforts to allay that irritability of public opinion which so frequently exasperates international differences and so greatly adds to the embarrassment of statesmen in guiding them to a peaceable issue. The letters which at that time passed between him and his correspondents in the United States abound with allusions to this subject. But in the crisis of the dispute Lord Ashburton had been sent out by our Government with plenipotentiary powers to deal with the matters in dispute. Without encumbering this page with extracts showing the deep anxiety felt on both sides of the Atlantic by those concerned for the preservation of peace, suffice it to give one from a letter of Mr. Tappan, accompanying the auspicious result of this happily-conceived mission. Writing under date of August 31, 1842, he says:—

‘I have time by this steamer to write only a few words. Lord Ashburton has concluded a treaty with our Government on terms advantageous to both nations. It has been ratified by the senate of the United States, and now awaits the ratification of Queen Victoria. Most of the troublesome matters are happily arranged. The *Creole* case is not included. Those violent men in this country who asserted that adherence to the ground taken by the British Government would be a just cause of war, have lowered their crests. Lord A. has conducted the matter with great ability and address, and the people here are forward in paying all the respect and honour to him that is in their power. How very thankful we ought to be that hostilities are prevented by this amicable arrangement. Just as easy would it always be to avoid war, if both parties were determined on maintaining amity. May we not hope that the war spirit has subsided, and that the

peaceful principles of the religion of the Prince of Peace will hereafter sway the councils of nations?’

But, about the years 1845-6, other questions of a dangerous import had sprung up between the two countries which began greatly to inflame the public mind, especially among our excitable cousins in America. The long-pending Oregon difficulty, in particular, assumed at one time a very menacing aspect. President Polk, in his message to Congress at the close of 1845, had adverted to the question in anything but a conciliatory tone. A portion of the American press was violent in the extreme, while certain members of Congress indulged very largely in what they called patriotism, but others bunkum. There was also in this country a party, happily at that time not large, disposed to respond to that foolish braggadocio in a tone of challenge and defiance not less fierce. One paper particularly, which was supposed to represent some portion of the deposed Whig ministry, laboured hard to exasperate the public mind, clamouring loudly for ‘a war minister, and twenty war steamers on the coast of America.’ Under these circumstances the peace party in England felt that they were called upon to put forth renewed activity to avert the threatened rupture. The Peace Society and the Society of Friends presented memorials to the Government in favour of settling the matter in dispute by arbitration, which were received by Sir Robert Peel and Lord Aberdeen with marked satisfaction. The gentlemen from the latter body who waited upon the prime minister reported that ‘he received the deputation with something more than courtesy, evincing by his remarks a deep interest in their object, and suggesting that our American brethren should use their influence in a

similar manner for its accomplishment.' At the instigation of the peace party in this country, a system of international correspondence was organised, which was attended with a very happy effect. Certain towns in England would send addresses, couched in language of kindness and good-will and strongly deprecating war, signed by the mayor and magistrates, the ministers of all denominations, and other leading inhabitants, to corresponding towns in America, supposed to bear some relation to them by identity of origin or interest, or by similarity of position and pursuit. These, in many instances, awoke on the other side of the Atlantic the heartiest responses, proving that in some cases the surest preservative of peace is for the *people* to step in front of the professional politicians, sometimes heated with a spirit of partisanship and personality, and speak to each other directly face to face and heart to heart.

Mr. Sturge threw himself into the movement of which we have spoken with uncommon earnestness. Writing to Mr. Lewis Tappan, on March 3, 1846, he says :—

'I am obliged by thine of the 30th of January, and was glad to learn from it and other quarters that the pacific tone of our press had been a source of satisfaction with you. I have been much engaged on this peace question lately. At a meeting at the Free Trade Hall in Manchester, there were probably 7,000 people present; and the feeling there and elsewhere is more on the side of peace than I could have hoped to see.'

In a letter to the same correspondent, two or three months later, he writes again :—

'I hope and trust that the good people of America will not allow their President and his mad and unprincipled supporters to plunge the two countries into war. I *think* if the fault is not more on the side of America than England that war will not take place. I enclose a copy of a short address

agreed to by our Peace Association to-day, and will thank thee to put it in such a way of publication as thou thinks best.'

There are frequent references, also, to the international addresses then in progress.* Among those who had joined in the war-like outcry in America was the venerable John Quincy Adams, who had delivered a violent speech in Congress which had deeply grieved some of his best friends on both sides of the Atlantic. Mr. Sturge, who, from community of sentiment on the slavery question, had been brought into rather intimate relations with Mr. Adams during his visit to America, was encouraged to write to him, which he did in a

* How these efforts of the friends of peace in England were regarded by those in America interested in the maintenance of peace, may be seen from the following extract from one of the foremost journals of the country:—

'Some days since, we copied from the *Manchester Times* (England) an "Appeal to the Merchants of the Realm," urging them to originate a friendly address from their body to the merchants of the United States. Nobly was it conceived, energetically was it expressed, and with full confidence that a kindred sentiment would actuate kindred minds on this side of the Atlantic. It concluded thus:—"Banish war from your very thoughts; and let your peaceful watchword be, on all occasions, 'Arbitrate! arbitrate!! arbitrate!!'" This language, be it observed, was addressed, not to Americans, but to Englishmen. It was an appeal to the better feelings of the human heart—to the spirit of Christianity, in opposition to the spirit of evil. When men can rise thus above the infirmities of their nature, bury their pride, and act the part of peace-makers, even at the risk of the misinterpretation of their motives, they show themselves to belong to the true nobility of their race, however deficient they may be in earth's titles and distinctions. There are some such noblemen in this country as well as in England, and the number is far greater than would be at first imagined. . . . Every day adds to the strength of the peace party. . . . The generous men in England who prompted the peace movement mentioned in the following documents, do not appear to have dreamed that arbitration would be refused by our Government. But they must not be discouraged, nor remit their efforts in so good a cause. Public opinion in this country moves slowly, but is very apt to come right at last.'—(From the *New York Journal of Commerce*, Feb. 12, 1846.)

letter of earnest and kind remonstrance. To this he refers in a letter to Mr. Tappan :—

‘A friend of mine, on whose judgment I place some reliance, wished me to write to J. Q. Adams. I doubt the use of it, but if thou approvest of the accompanying letter, send it. . . . We are a good deal concerned, and fear the consequence of the news just arrived that your President has refused to arbitrate. Surely the time is come for a separation of the Union.’

Happily, we had then, on this side of the water, a minister who knew how to combine with the maintenance of national dignity a cordial love of peace, while the press and people generally had not yet been imbued with that spirit of mingled pugnacity and panic which has since been developed amongst us, under the influence of what has assumed the pseudonym of ‘a public spirited policy.’ Instead of hurling defiance at President Polk, Sir Robert Peel displayed throughout a calm and conciliatory temper; and Lord Aberdeen, taking advantage of a reaction in Congress against the war party, sent out a new proposal of compromise to our Minister at Washington, which happily, after a long and violent debate, was approved by a large majority of the Senate. Our press also, with the exception already indicated, instead of retorting upon our choleric cousins the fillibustering tone which many of them had assumed, turned it aside with a smile of good-humoured pleasantry, and proved the truth of the ancient adage, which, unhappily, has of late fallen into so much disrepute amongst us, that ‘A soft answer turneth away wrath.’

The following extracts from two letters of Mr. Whittier to Mr. Sturge, the first dated January, the other March, 1846, refer to some of those points, and show

how deep was the anxiety felt by the friends of peace on both sides of the Atlantic during that critical conjuncture :—

‘Thy kind note by the last steamer has reached me. I had looked to the arrival of that steamer with intense interest. The tone of President Polk’s message in relation to Oregon was a source of great regret, even to those who, like myself, believe that the American title to that territory is a good one. War, at this day, and between two nations of highly professing Christians, would be an awful absurdity. I am glad to see that the whole tone of the English press is peaceful—the bravado of the message appears to be pretty well estimated. In Congress, on our side the water, a debate is going on which looks at times rather warlike; but I can assure thee that a great deal of the ferocity is assumed by the speakers, and for *home* effect. It looks *patriotic* to eulogise ourselves and abuse the British. Among our Indians it is customary to set up a log or post, painted so as to have some faint resemblance of a warrior of a hostile tribe; and each young savage marches bravely up to it and smites it with his tomahawk, in this way giving proof of his manhood. It is very much so with our new members of Congress. They belabour the British lion *in the abstract* just as the Indians do the painted log.’

‘I have seen with no slight degree of interest that the friends of peace in Great Britain are actively engaged in the good work of repressing the war feeling. We are doing what we can here. I hope our friends will act on the suggestion thrown out by Sir Robert Peel in his interview with English Friends. I have hopes that our Meeting for Sufferings in New England will act. The tone of many members of Congress, and of a portion of our editors of public papers, is as vindictive and warlike as the enemy of all good could well wish; but the great body of both Congress and people are in favour of peace. Nobody here expects war. Our Government has evidently never expected it, for they are wholly unprepared for it. For my own part, I think there is every

reason to believe that the offer on the part of your Government of the 49° boundary would be accepted by our own.'

To the same effect was the language of Mr. Tappan :

'The peace addresses that have been sent to this country by numerous bodies of men in yours have been widely published, and are producing a most beneficial effect. Not only are the Christians of both countries opposed to war, but the considerate and judicious inhabitants of England and the United States see that it would produce mighty evils without any compensating good. The friends of peace in this country, also, are active in disseminating their principles. May the Prince of Peace bless their efforts, and listen to the prayers of His people so that war may be averted!'

On the American side, also, some of their ablest statesmen set themselves resolutely to oppose the cry of the fillibusterers. Mr. Calhoun and Mr. Benton, in particular, spoke with great wisdom and moderation; and it was largely by their influence that the policy of Congress was guided into the ways of peace:—

'The Oregon question,' says Mr. Tappan in a letter dated May 27, 1846, 'you may deem settled. Mr. Benton, the leading democrat in the Senate, in a speech begun last Friday, continued on Monday, and to be concluded on Wednesday, has demonstrated that the United States has no just claim to any of the territory north of the 49°; that the 55° has been the *northern* boundary of Great Britain. His collection of facts is so ample and his argument so conclusive, that it will be impossible, I think, for the administration at Washington to contend that we have any reasonable claim to an inch of territory beyond the 49°.'

There were other questions, moreover, which at that time demanded the vigilance and activity of the friends of peace. The Government, for no very intelligible reason, introduced a Militia Bill into Parliament, the

first of a long series of efforts, which proved ultimately successful, to frighten the British public into a state of panic, under the influence of which the military establishments might be increased to any extent. Mr. Sturge, in common with all the members of the peace party, and in common, indeed, with the great majority of the nation, at that time; felt the strongest antipathy to this measure. An agitation was organised against it upon a large scale; meetings were held in most of the large towns, and petitions poured in to Parliament at such a rate as convinced the Government that it would not be safe to attempt to force it upon the country. It was accordingly abandoned for the time, while the excitement it occasioned afforded an excellent opportunity to the friends of peace, of which they were not slow to avail themselves, to teach to the people the Christian doctrines of peace on earth and good-will among men. A crowded meeting was held at the Town Hall, Birmingham, at which resolutions utterly condemning the principles and practices of war were carried by acclamation. This, in a town so largely dependent upon the manufacture of arms, was deemed a significant indication of the pacific temper of the times. The following letter from Mr. Douglas Jerrold, whose witty and incisive pen was habitually employed on the side of humanity and peace, shows how vigilantly Mr. Sturge put himself in communication with all, in whatever circle, who contributed to the promotion of the great Christian ideas whose triumph he was so anxious to secure. He had a considerable correspondence with Mr. Jerrold about this time, on the same subjects:—

‘East Lodge, Putney, Surrey: Feb. 22, 1846.

‘DEAR SIR,—Thanks for your kind letter. It is my intention to follow up the subjects of soldiering and war and

judicial man-killing, in "Punch," in my Magazine, and in the "Daily News." In the latter paper it is my design to write on the Peace Movement on Monday—the subject is as suggestive as it is noble. I have met with many remonstrances, with much abuse, for a recent article in "Punch," on "The Moral Lessons of the Gallows," but shall go on in the full assurance that that iniquity cannot and must not continue. The fact of an anti-war meeting taking place in what may be called the arsenal of England, is, indeed, encouraging. I shall be happy to receive, at any time, information that you may think capable of being used in furtherance of the good cause, and am,

'Yours sincerely,

'DOUGLAS JERROLD.'

In the early part of 1848, England and Europe were startled with the intelligence that a revolution had broken out in Paris, that Louis Philippe and his family were deposed and fugitive; that a republic had been proclaimed, and a provisional government formed, at the head of which were Lamartine, and Arago, and Ledru Rollin. The new order of things had begun hopefully. The Parisians had, on the whole, shown great moderation and self-control in the midst of their triumphs. Lamartine's commanding eloquence had succeeded in wielding at will the fierce democracy which had surged day by day around the Hôtel de Ville, and dissuading the populace from unfurling the red flag and rushing into an armed propagandism on behalf of the nationalities. The manifesto he issued on taking possession of the Foreign Office was so wise and conciliatory as to inspire confidence in the other European Governments. It is almost inevitable that sudden changes like that, effected ostensibly in the interests of popular liberty, should awaken rather too exalted hopes in sanguine and generous natures.

Such was the effect produced in England by the third French Revolution. Meetings were held in various parts of the country to congratulate the people of France on what was supposed to be the final achievement of their political freedom. Among others was one held in London, at which it was resolved to send a deputation to Paris with an address of sympathy and respect to the Provisional Government. Mr. Sturge was one of those appointed to be the bearers of the address. The deep interest he ever felt in the cause of popular liberty would no doubt of itself have inclined him to accept this nomination. But there were other motives of still more prevailing force probably in his case. In the first flush of enthusiasm the men who had been so hastily summoned to guide the French nation in that moment of anarchy had decreed the abolition, first of capital punishment for political offences, and secondly of slavery in all the French colonies, and these measures had been ratified with acclamation by the popular voice. Still there was danger lest such ebullitions of humane and magnanimous impulse should, amid the excitements of the occasion, fail to be translated into act. Mr. Sturge therefore felt, especially in regard to the question of slavery, that the presence and friendly encouragement of some of those who had been prominently connected with the abolition movement in England might furnish just the sort of stimulus that was required to prevent the generous intentions of the Provisional Government from lapsing. Happily, as he afterwards found, M. Victor Schœlcher, who was at the time Under-Secretary for the Colonies, was thoroughly devoted to the cause of the slave, though no doubt he was greatly cheered and strengthened by the counsels, at that moment, of one who had borne so

conspicuous a part in the abolition of British Colonial Slavery.

An extract or two from letters which he wrote to Mrs. Sturge while at Paris, will give us a glimpse into scenes and circumstances not without considerable historic interest:—

‘Paris: 3rd mo. 11, 1848.

‘After I wrote thee yesterday, G. W. Alexander and I called on Isambert and General Arthur O’Connor, but did not find either of them at home. We saw, however, the wife of the latter, and she made an appointment for us to meet them at seven o’clock, at Isambert’s, where we found them accordingly at that hour of the evening. The General came to breakfast with us this morning, and afterwards accompanied G. W. A. and myself to M. Arago, the Minister of Marine, on the Anti-slavery question. He was not within, but we are to see him at eight o’clock to-morrow. We have a letter from Lamartine to-day, fixing half-past three o’clock to-morrow for us to meet the Provisional Government. As General O’Connor is a personal friend of several of the ministers, and perfectly master of both languages, we have asked him to accompany us, and he has put off a journey to Orleans in order to do so. The weather is beautifully fine, and few would suppose that so great a revolution had so recently taken place here. Even in the Tuileries there is little trace of it but a few broken windows, and the trees there seem quite uninjured.

‘3rd mo. 3.—This morning G. W. Alexander and I went with General O’Connor to call upon the Minister of Marine on the Anti-slavery question, and had a *very* satisfactory interview with him. The rest of the morning we employed in calling upon the old friends of the Anti-slavery cause. At three o’clock we started, with O’Connor as our interpreter, to the Hôtel de Ville, to present the address. When we arrived, we found the ante-chamber crowded with English residents in Paris, who had an appointment half-an-hour before us to present an address. But, quite unexpectedly,

we were called in before them, and found the new ministers surrounded by the official splendour so recently vacated by royalty. The President of the Council was not present, and Lamartine acted as president. He requested that I should read the address, and, as far as I could see, he spoke English well. After I had concluded, he made a speech in reply in French, which, as I was informed, was a cordial response to the sentiments of the address. As there were reporters present, there will, I expect, be a full account both of the address and speech. I made one or two remarks, and G. W. A. said a few words on the Anti-slavery question. Upon the whole, our reception was very cordial. . . . We afterwards saw the Under-Secretary for the Colonies, who has to draw up the Act of Abolition, and he gave us some confidential information which quite satisfied us of their determination totally and immediately to abolish slavery.'

It is hardly necessary to say that, both from principle and temper, Mr. Sturge was a thorough friend of religious liberty. The Society to which he belonged is perhaps the only sect that has never persecuted for conscience sake, while the firm but patient and peaceful spirit in which they have borne their own sufferings from that source, has done more than almost anything else to make others ashamed of persecution. An opportunity was afforded him about the time at which we have now arrived in his history to give a signal proof of his readiness to vindicate the religious rights even of those from whom he was most widely separated in matters of creed and observance.

The latter part of the year 1850 was marked by a sudden and most vehement anti-papal excitement which swept like a hurricane over the face of the island. It had seemed good to the Pope to issue an 'Apostolic letter,' as it was called, establishing a Roman Catholic Episcopal hierarchy in England. The country was

divided into sees, and was to be governed ecclesiastically by one archbishop and twelve suffragans—these dignitaries to derive their titles from their own sees, and to be called Archbishop of Westminster, Bishop of Southwark, Bishop of Northampton, &c. This arrangement, it was hoped, ‘would by the grace of God bring new and daily increase to the power of Catholicism.’ It was, no doubt, an absurd and arrogant document, and might have justified some indignation and a great deal of ridicule. But instead of looking upon it in that light, the public mind rushed into one of those violent paroxysms of panic to which, for a people naturally so sensible and sedate, we are singularly prone. The papal rescript was everywhere denounced as dealing a deadly blow at the British constitution and the Protestant religion. The old Anti-popery cry was raised from John O’Groat’s House to the Land’s End, and the Government and Parliament were assailed with loud demands for immediate legislation, as the only means of saving our liberties and our faith from destruction. There were a few, and only a few, of the old friends of religious freedom who stood faithful to their principles at that crisis. Among these was Joseph Sturge. It is hardly necessary to say that he had not the remotest sympathy with the Roman Catholic faith. But he felt strongly that the outcry which resounded through the country was absurdly out of proportion to any just cause of alarm that existed, and was like to hurry the nation into conclusions which would be far more injurious to the interests both of civil liberty and true Protestant principles than the alleged ‘Popish invasion.’ When, therefore, a town’s meeting was called by requisition in Birmingham to consider the question, he felt bound, at whatever sacrifice of feeling, to stand in the

breach and, to the best of his ability, to oppose what he could not but feel an unworthy outbreak of fanaticism. As soon as the meeting was announced, he issued the following address:—

‘TO THE FRIENDS OF CIVIL AND RELIGIOUS LIBERTY IN
BIRMINGHAM.

‘FELLOW-TOWNSMEN,—Though strongly opposed on principle to both the contending hierarchies, I have been so much surprised and grieved at observing some of you uniting in the clamour which has been created in consequence of an alleged aggression by the Pope, that I venture to ask whether you have not far more reason to condemn the State Church, which has raised the storm—a Church which, while a large proportion of its clergy profess similar doctrines to those which are denounced, appropriates vast public revenues to the support of its ecclesiastical establishment, and even employs the power of the State to tax the members of other religious communions for the same purpose?

‘As a town’s meeting has been called on the subject for the 11th instant, allow me to submit that it is your duty to attend and negative proceedings that are dangerous to religious freedom.

‘Very respectfully,

‘JOSEPH STURGE.

‘Birmingham: 12th mo. (Dec.) 8, 1850.’

On the appointed day the meeting was held at the Town hall. The excitement was intense. ‘Of the number present,’ said the ‘Birmingham Mercury,’ ‘we are speaking within bounds when we say that there were upwards of 8,000, all the seats in the ground-floor being withdrawn, and the vacant space crammed to the extreme.’ A memorial to the Queen was proposed, denouncing the Pope’s bull in the usual terms as ‘an audacious attack upon our civil and religious liberty,’ and praying Her Majesty to ‘take immediate steps to vin-

dicate her prerogative,' &c. When the mover and seconder of the memorial had finished their speeches, Mr. Sturge rose to move an amendment. This was the signal for a tremendous storm of disapprobation and counter-cheers. The amendment declared that, in the opinion of Her Majesty's loyal subjects of the borough of Birmingham, the appointment of the Roman Catholic hierarchy did not require any legislative interference. 'We respectfully, yet earnestly, deprecate,' it continued, 'all restrictions upon the free enjoyment by every religious body within your Majesty's dominions of its spiritual order and discipline. We therefore entreat your Majesty to sanction such measures as may be proposed for securing the maintenance of civil and religious liberty.' All the notabilities of Birmingham were present and took part in the debate that ensued, and which lasted all day, the excitement growing more fast and furious as the decision drew nigh. It ended in a kind of drawn battle, the mayor, after putting the amendment and original resolution, declaring that 'the amendment *was not carried*,' and that 'the original resolution *was lost*.' This was, of course, tantamount to a defeat of the requisitionists. The effect of this meeting was great, not only in Birmingham, but throughout the country. It was the first occasion on which the tide of anti-papal agitation had been resisted and turned. No doubt the task which Mr. Sturge had to perform on that day was, in many respects, painful to him. He had to appear in opposition to old friends, like John Angell James and others, with whom it had been the pleasure of his life to cooperate. But it was a duty from which he dared not shrink, and we believe his mind was never to the end of life troubled with a solitary misgiving as to the part he acted on that occasion.

CHAPTER XX.

THE PEACE MOVEMENT.

Mr. Sturge's Principles respecting War—Long interval of Rest after the Peace of 1816—Growth of Pacific Sentiments in Europe—Speeches of Sir James Mackintosh and Sir Robert Peel—Accession of the Whigs deemed an additional Guarantee for Peace—The Change in our Foreign Policy—Wars and Rumours of Wars—Revival of old Animosity between England and France—First Invasion Panic—Efforts of the Friends of Peace—Diffusion of the Christian Doctrine of Peace—Movement in favour of International Arbitration—Mr. Cobden's Motion in Parliament—Peace Congresses on the Continent—Mr. Sturge's large Share in the Peace Movement—The Value of his Services—Extracts from his Letter to Mr. Tappan, Rev. John Clark, and Mr. Whittier.

WE are now coming to a period when Mr. Sturge's time and labours became increasingly devoted to the Peace question. As a Friend, he had been, of course, taught from his childhood to regard all war as unchristian. But this tenet became to him something far more than one of the dogmas of an hereditary creed. In proportion as his own spirit was brought under the power of the Gospel, did this tradition which he had received from the fathers deepen into a profound personal conviction. His belief, like that of most of those who share his views, rested not, as is generally but mistakenly represented, upon a literal construction of a few isolated passages of Scripture, but upon what he felt by an instinct of his Christian consciousness to be an essential and irreconcilable antagonism in principle, spirit, and tendency, between a religion of charity and

brotherly love and the whole system of malignity and violence which war inevitably develops. Though it was a matter of genuine and sorrowful surprise to him how those who accepted the New Testament as their rule and faith and practice could reach conclusions so different from his own, he ever desired to cherish his views with perfect charity to others.

‘It is a mystery,’ he says, in a letter to a friend, ‘which I cannot fathom, why those who are equally anxious to act up to the directions and spirit of the New Testament, see so differently as to what these require. Nothing, for instance, has surprised and grieved me more than to witness the views entertained by many on the subject of war, who, I cannot doubt, have made much further advances in the Christian life than I have. But it seems to be the will of Him who is infinite in wisdom, that light upon great subjects should first arise, and be gradually spread, through the faithfulness of *individuals* in acting up to their own convictions. I suppose it was the faithfulness of John Woolman, in reference not only to holding slaves but to the disuse of slave-grown produce, that did more than anything else towards clearing the Society of Friends both of slave-holding and slave-dealing, though he appears to have stood comparatively alone for many years.’

We have already seen that very early in life Mr. Sturge warmly espoused the cause of the Peace Society, and ever after he continued earnestly interested in its principles and operations. But about the time at which we are now arrived, various circumstances combined to call the friends of peace into greater or at least into more public activity. A brief retrospect of events will enable us better to understand the occasion and object of the movement then initiated in which Mr. Sturge bore so prominent a part.

After the long agony of the continental war had been

brought to an end by the peace of 1816, the nation had enjoyed in its foreign relations a period of comparative rest for many years. The sacrifices and sufferings of that terrible conflict were still fresh in men's memories, and served to temper the spirit of strife. The national exhaustion which ensued, and the urgent necessity of attending to questions of domestic policy which had been almost wholly neglected during the war, left to the country little leisure or inclination to engage in foreign quarrels. The Government of the Duke of Wellington and Sir Robert Peel was also eminently pacific. In a debate on the affairs of Portugal, which took place in the House of Commons only a few months before the dissolution of that Government, Sir James Mackintosh spoke of 'the strong and growing passion for peace, which, whatever might be the political intrigues of some parties, he rejoiced to say was visibly extending and growing through every nation in Europe, and which, he would add, was the best legacy left us by that fierce war that had raged from Copenhagen to Cadiz.' To this Sir Robert (then Mr.) Peel immediately responded, and begged 'at once to express his cordial concurrence with the sentiments of the right hon. gentleman respecting the blessings and advantages of peace, and his congratulations for the happiness which fifteen years' entire freedom from war—an unusual circumstance in our latter history—had afforded us. 'I do hope,' he added, 'that one great and most beneficial effect of the advance of civilisation, the diffusion of knowledge and the extension of commerce, will be the reducing within their proper dimensions the fame, the merits, and the rewards of military achievements, and that juster notions of the moral dignity of, and of the moral obligation due to, those who apply themselves

to preserve peace and avoid the *éclat* of war, will be the consequence.' When the Whigs came into power in 1830, their accession was regarded as furnishing additional guarantees for a pacific national policy. They had acquired a traditional reputation as the friends of peace, which was confirmed by the passionate philippics on the danger of standing armies and the duty of largely reducing the military establishments which they had scarcely ceased to utter since the peace of 1816. Peace also formed a prominent feature in the political programme they issued on their first assumption of office. 'Our true policy,' said Earl Grey, in the first speech he delivered in the House of Lords as prime minister, 'is to maintain universal peace, and therefore non-interference is the principle, the great principle which ought to be and will be heartily adopted by the present administration.' Nor was the expectation which these promises inspired, disappointed while Earl Grey continued at the head of affairs. But on his retirement a different spirit seemed to influence our Foreign Office. Never did a party more utterly drift away from the professions with which they came into power, than the Whig party did as respects the question of peace during the subsequent six or seven years of their official existence. Whether it was their fault or their misfortune, they seemed destined by some unhappy fatality to embroil us in war or the danger of war in all parts of the world. There was a dispute with America on the subject of the Maine boundary and the right of search, which brought us to the very verge of war. The same may be said of France on the Syrian question, and also on the right of search. It is probable, indeed, that nothing but the timely accession to office of Sir Robert Peel and Lord Aberdeen in 1841 saved us from

actual rupture with these two great nations. There was angry jealousy of Russia, which hurried us into foolish and guilty enterprises in India. We had threatened Persia with our displeasure, and there was an armed force in the Persian Gulf. There had been actual war in Syria, and a *quasi-war* in Spain, the Foreign Enlistment Act having been suspended, and an auxiliary Legion raised to fight in the domestic quarrels of that country, while a naval squadron cooperated off the coast. We had been involved in a state of hostilities with the vast empire of China which was not only discreditable in itself, but pregnant with a long progeny of future evils, the end of which is not yet come. In India there was the disgraceful and disastrous expedition to Afghanistan, which led almost inevitably to the subsequent wars in Scinde and in the Punjaub. There were bloody insurrections among our own subjects in Canada and in Ceylon, to say nothing of frequent wars with the aborigines in South Africa and New Zealand. And as the necessary accompaniment of this warlike outbreak, forms and fashions which had happily been in abeyance for many years sprung again into vogue. There were votes of thanks in Parliament to successful warriors, with all that extravagant glorification of military skill and prowess usual on such occasions. There were thanksgiving services in churches and chapels, where Christians met to sing hymns of praise over bloody but 'glorious' victories,

'Hymns to the Father o'er His slaughtered sons.'

Bishops in their lawn sleeves and other ecclesiastical dignitaries came forth to 'consecrate' with Christian prayer and benediction, in the name of the Prince of Peace, the banners that were to float over fields of

strife and carnage. Writers in the public press, especially those in the service of the Government, began to reproduce the old immoral and unchristian paradoxes which represent a state of war as favourable, and the state of peace as unfavourable, to the growth of the higher virtues—paradoxes which are never brought forth except when men have need to reconcile their consciences to their passions.

The tendency of all this was to revive the war spirit, which had, happily, for some years slumbered in this country and in Europe. During the early part of Sir Robert Peel's ministry the elements of discord were to a large extent composed. The presence of Lord Aberdeen at the Foreign Office had served to tranquilise our relations both with the Continent and with America. The great agitation for the repeal of the Corn Laws, impelled and intensified as it was by severe distress at home, compelled that attention to domestic matters which, in periods of prosperity, is apt to give way to a restless propensity to intermeddle in other people's affairs. Towards the close of the Peel administration, as we have seen, difficulties of a serious nature had arisen between this country and both France and America. But most of these had been happily adjusted by Lord Aberdeen before he quitted office. One question, however, was still left to disturb the relations of England and France. This was the question of the Spanish marriages, in respect to which, and the intense excitement it produced on both sides of the Channel, events have since administered to all the parties concerned a rebuke so bitterly ironical. But absurd as the cause of quarrel now appears, and indeed was at any time, it gave rise to intense soreness of feeling, which it was understood was anything but allayed by

the change which took place at that critical moment in the occupancy of the Foreign Office. Advantage was taken of it in both countries by a class of persons whose patriotism takes the form of fear and hatred of other nations, rather than love of their own, to revive and exasperate to the utmost the old hereditary prejudices between England and France. In the latter country there was a great outcry, led on by the Prince de Joinville, for a large increase of the French navy to protect the coasts of France from the overwhelming naval power of England. This was responded to on our side by the first of that series of invasion panics which has since attacked us periodically at certain intervals, like the cholera or other epidemic. Unhappily some of the leaders of the panic persuaded the Duke of Wellington, then in the decline of his powerful intellect, to indite a letter, which straightway became the text on which the alarmists preached incessantly from press and platform. A bad and bitter feeling was growing up between the two nations, or at least between the official classes, diplomatic and military, who were doing their best, by inflammatory articles and letters in the journals, and by loud demands for increased armaments, to inoculate the people of both nations with the same feeling.

It was not without reason, therefore, that the friends of peace, when they saw how the elements of strife had been thus gathering for years in every part of our vast empire, felt that they were called upon to use what influence they could bring to bear to counteract these dangerous tendencies. On the other hand it was hoped, and surely on perfectly rational grounds, that the triumph of free trade, by bringing the nations of the earth more and more into habits of friendly intercourse

and into relations of mutual dependence, would tend greatly to the promotion of peace.* Under the impulse of this double motive, one of fear and the other of hope, the peace party started into increased activity. Their operations were manifold. First, they set themselves to diffuse among the people as widely as they could the Christian doctrines of peace, and to oppose the attempts that were very resolutely made in those days to rekindle the war spirit in the country by appealing to the old feeling of suspicion and hatred against France. Unhappily, the Government, while using language of the friendliest description as respects our relations with our neighbours, gave, nevertheless, an implied sanction to the panic by introducing measures which could only be justified by the presence of some impending danger. At the beginning of 1848, Lord John Russell proposed to Parliament an increase of 5*d.*

* There can be no doubt that the leading men in the anti-corn-law agitation looked to far wider and nobler results of their labour than mere commercial and economical gains, vast as they believed those would be. The following are the words of the greatest of them all :—

‘I have never taken a limited view of the object or scope of this great principle. I have been accused of looking too much to material interests. Nevertheless, I can say that I have taken as large a view of the effects of this mighty principle as ever did any man who dreamt over it in his own study. I believe that the physical gain will be the smallest gain to humanity from the success of this principle. I look further; I see in the free-trade principle that which shall act on the moral world as the principle of gravitation in the universe—drawing men together, thrusting aside the antagonism of race, and creed, and language, and uniting us in the bonds of eternal peace. I have looked even further; I have speculated—perhaps I ought to say dreamt—on what the effect of the triumphs of this principle may be in the dim future—aye, a thousand years hence. I believe that the desire and the motive for large and mighty empires, for gigantic armies and great navies, for those materials that are used for the destruction of life and the desolation of the rewards of labour, will die away. I believe that such things will cease to be necessary, or to be used, when man becomes one family, and freely exchanges the fruits of his labour with his brother man.’—Mr. Cobden’s Speech at Manchester, Jan. 15, 1840.

in the pound in the income-tax, to enable Government to reorganise the militia and considerably increase the armaments. Mr. Sturge and his associates felt themselves entitled, and indeed imperatively called upon, strenuously to resist this proposal. In addition to the old Peace Society, a special committee was formed, principally by his instigation, called 'The National Defences Committee,' expressly for the purpose of evoking a public feeling against the measures of the Government. The two bodies, however, worked in concert. Meetings were held in all parts of the country. Petitions were sent to Parliament in large numbers, and it soon became pretty clear that the alarmists had failed, as yet, to infect the nation with their own panic fears. The result was, that the Militia Bill had to be withdrawn; and the following year, though in the meanwhile the French revolution had broken out, and Louis Napoleon had been elected President of the new Republic, the ministers appeared before Parliament with the declaration that 'large *reductions* had been made on the estimates of last year.'

About the same time the friends of peace began another movement of a more definite nature. All history attests that wars often break out, not because the differences which must sometimes arise in the intercourse of nations as of individuals are incapable of a pacific solution, but because no provision has been made for referring the matters in dispute to any other than the blind and brutal arbitration of the sword. Ample as are the arrangements made under the constitution of civil society for adjusting the conflicting claims of its members, without which, indeed, no society could exist for a day, in the great commonwealth of nations no foresight is exercised, no precaution is taken, but every-

thing is left to the excited passions and hazardous accidents of the moment.

The friends of peace had frequently before petitioned Parliament and memorialised our own and other governments in favour of arbitration, as a means of settling international disputes. But there had been great difficulty in bringing the matter in a distinct form before the attention of the legislature. The official class, trained in other traditions and with a mortal dread of innovation, clung with great tenacity to the belief that when the negotiations of diplomacy had once failed there was no other resource possible but the *ultima ratio regum*. It was natural enough, no doubt, that they should deem themselves more competent judges of such matters than the rest of mankind, and be inclined to resent the intrusion of anyone else within the charmed circle where they held sway, as an impertinent reflection on their own superior wisdom and experience. It was their cue, therefore, to throw an air of ridicule upon all propositions involving a departure from their precedents, and to brand them as the offspring of, it may be an amiable, but still an utterly utopian philanthropy. Under these circumstances it was not easy to find a person with sufficient moral courage to introduce a motion in Parliament on this question. Mr. Cobden, however, who has an uncourtly habit of exercising an independent judgment upon most subjects, did not shrink from this duty. Towards the close of 1848 he gave notice of his intention to propose, during the next session, a resolution for

‘An humble address to Her Majesty, praying that she will be graciously pleased to direct her principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs to enter into communication with foreign powers, inviting them to concur in treaties binding

the respective parties, in the event of any future misunderstanding which cannot be arranged by amicable negotiation, to refer the matter in dispute to the decision of arbitrators.'

This gave the peace party an opportunity, of which they earnestly availed themselves, to bring the subject of arbitration before the attention of the British public. The appeal to the country was eminently successful. Crowded meetings were held in all parts of the kingdom, at which petitions to Parliament in favour of the motion were adopted with singular unanimity and enthusiasm. Mr. Cobden, referring to this in a letter to Mr. Sturge, says:—

'I have been delighted with the success of your meetings. You peace people seem to be the only men who have courage just now to call a public meeting. I always say that there is more real pluck in the ranks of the Quakers than in all our regiments of redcoats. . . . What progress has been made in public opinion during the last twelvemonths. . . . Much of it is due to the efforts of your Peace Society. In fact, all good things pull together. Free trade, peace, financial reform, equitable taxation, all are cooperating towards a common object.'

And although the first announcement by Mr. Cobden of his intention to bring the question forward was received by the House with a general laugh, yet so unequivocally had public opinion pronounced itself in the meanwhile, that when the night for the discussion arrived, hon. gentlemen had entirely lost their disposition to laugh, and after a long, serious, and able debate, no fewer than seventy-nine votes, including those of the representatives of nearly all the largest constituencies in the kingdom, were recorded in its favour.

There was a third method of operation adopted by the friends of peace at the time of which we are now

speaking. Feeling that much of the prejudice and alienation existing between nations arose from pure ignorance of each other, and that it would be of the utmost value in promoting practical measures tending to peace to enlist the public opinions of the different countries of Europe at the same time in their favour, it was resolved that an attempt should be made to invade the continent with the propagandism of peace. The revolution of 1848 had served to awaken and diffuse a large amount of sympathy among the *peoples* of Europe, and to give them a dim perception of the great Christian doctrine of the universal brotherhood of man. The time, therefore, was not unpropitious for the experiment. Just at that moment, too, Mr. Elihu Burritt, who had already distinguished himself in America by his writings on peace, visited this country; and full of generous ardour on behalf of these ideas, he proposed to Mr. Sturge and others that the friends of peace should hold an international congress in Paris. In the summer of 1848 he proceeded alone to that city, intent upon accomplishing this purpose. Circumstances, however, rendered it desirable that for that year the attempt should be made at Brussels rather than in Paris. The proposal to make their capital the seat of the first Peace Congress was received by the Belgian Government and people with the utmost cordiality. A number of Belgian gentlemen, at the head of whom was M. Auguste Visschers, who has since acquired a European reputation as a *sarant* and philanthropist, formed themselves into a committee to cooperate with the deputation sent from England. The meeting was held on the 20th, 21st, and 22nd of September, under the presidency of M. Visschers, and was in all respects eminently successful and satisfactory. We are not now writing the history of the peace

movement, and cannot, therefore, enter into a detailed account of that series of remarkable assemblies of which this at Brussels was the first. Suffice it to say, that for several years in succession the Peace Congress held its annual session, first in Paris, then in Frankfort, London, Manchester, Edinburgh, with an ever-increasing number of adherents. At the meeting in Paris, presided over by Victor Hugo, the large room (Salle de St. Cécile) in the Rue de la Chaussée d'Antin, capable of accommodating nearly 2,000 persons, was crowded day by day by delegates representing nearly every country in Europe, and several in America. The same may be said of that at Frankfort, which was held in the noble Church of St. Paul's, kindly placed at the disposal of the Congress by the Consistory of the Lutheran Church, and of which Councillor Jaup, formerly prime minister of Hesse-Darmstadt, was the president; while the meeting in London in 1851, under the presidency of Sir David Brewster, was still more numerous attended. The object of these assemblies was not—as it is the pleasure of those to represent who feel it to be their interest or duty always to decry and ridicule such movements—to proclaim the advent of a millennium of universal peace. They sprung from a precisely opposite conviction, the conviction that unless some measures were taken by governments and peoples, during the lucid interval of comparative European peace they were then enjoying, to provide some other means than the sword for the adjustment of international difficulties, and to reduce the standing armaments which were growing with such ominous rapidity during peace, there was the most imminent danger that Europe would, ere long, be again dragged into the vortex of war. They met, not to indulge in premature and sentimental felicitations.

tions on the extinction of the evil, but to stimulate each other to labour in their respective countries, and according to the measure of their influence and ability, in support of taking such precautions as might lessen the probability of its recurrence. To this end they recommended that arbitration treaties should be formed between nations, which might gradually develop and ripen into something like a court and congress of nations; that the principle of non-intervention should be universally adopted; that Governments should come to an understanding for a mutual and simultaneous reduction of their armaments; that all encouragement should be given to the improvement of international communication, the extension of postal reform, the adoption of the same standard of weights, measures, and coinage; that those engaged in the education of youth, ministers of religion, and the conductors of the public press, should be exhorted to use their influence to eradicate from the minds of men those political prejudices and hereditary hatreds which have so often been the cause of war, and to diffuse sentiments of peace and good-will among the people. Such were the objects of the Peace Congress. Many of the foremost men in Europe gave it their sanction and encouragement, and it contributed largely, beyond doubt, to lift into European notice and discussion certain great principles of religion and humanity which had been too long neglected, and which cannot fail ultimately to bear fruit in the relation of nations. It is true, also, unquestionably, that it afforded ample occasion for the sceptic and the scorner to exercise their peculiar gifts. Nor can it be denied that the outbreak of the Russian war, in 1854, by letting out the waters of strife which have since so abundantly deluged the world, and putting a stop, at least for a time, to the exertions of the Peace

Congress, gave to this class a great temporary triumph, to their own high satisfaction, if we may judge by their tone; but whether to the advantage of Europe, or the general happiness of mankind, it may be permitted us to question.

We have thought this brief sketch of the peace movement necessary, by way of explaining the allusions made in Mr. Sturge's correspondence, from which we shall have occasion immediately to present the reader with a few extracts. But no extracts from letters can give any adequate impression of the part he bore in the work of which we have been speaking. Indeed, for several years of his life—from 1848 to 1854—a large proportion of his time, energies, and influence were devoted to it, and around no one's personal history could the movement be made to revolve with greater propriety than around his. For he was to a large extent its animating spirit. It was at the period to which we now refer that the biographer was first brought into intimate personal relations with Mr. Sturge. Having become secretary to the Peace Society in 1848, just at the commencement of that series of special operations we have just attempted to describe, a good deal of the labour and responsibility connected with them necessarily devolved upon him. He was, therefore, in a position to understand well the extent and value of Mr. Sturge's services. And, in truth, it would be difficult to exaggerate them. His activity of body and mind was marvellous. As the poet says of another character, 'He was a man of an unsleeping spirit;' nor was it easy for anyone engaged in the same enterprise with him to slumber at his post. Not that there was anything fussy or dictatorial in his manner, but that the contagion of his earnestness communicated itself to all those around

him. Who could complain of being stimulated to exertion by one who was willing himself to bear so large a share of the burden of labour? Whatever the department of service in which his aid was required, it was rendered with equal cheerfulness and promptitude. The slightest intimation that his presence would be useful in London brought him up at once from Birmingham, and with no less readiness he would speed to any part of the kingdom to attend a public meeting or to confer with some important friend of the cause. If funds were required to carry on the agitation, his hand was ever 'open as day,' while his application to others—from which, though not a very pleasant duty, he never shrunk—few could be found to resist, coming from one who was known to testify his own value of the cause on whose behalf he pleaded by such large sacrifices of time, labour, and money. But more valuable than all to those associated with him were those moral qualities of character by which he was distinguished; his calm courage springing from unfaltering faith in the truth and power of great principles; the habitual serenity of temper which no excitement or provocation could seriously ruffle; the utter self-forgetfulness which never intruded the susceptibilities of personal vanity to disturb the conduct of a great enterprise; and the sunny cheerfulness of mind which seldom failed to light up the less sanguine spirits of some of his associates with a ray of hope in the darkest hour of discouragement and gloom. He had, moreover, the rare and inexpressibly valuable power of inspiring undoubting confidence in the purity and simplicity of his own motives, which drew men towards him with a sort of instinctive and child-like trust. It was curious to observe during those congresses in foreign countries, which brought together

many hundreds of persons from all parts of the kingdom, how, without any obtrusion of himself into prominence, all the company would cluster around Joseph Sturge as their natural leader, just as the swarm clusters around the queen bee.

In introducing the following extract from a letter to Mr. Tappan, dated November 17, 1848, it is necessary to premise that the allusion in the first sentence is to another of those critical conjunctures in business to which those engaged in large mercantile affairs are liable :—

‘Though the effects of the storm last year are still seriously felt by me in pecuniary matters, yet as the anxiety from this source is now comparatively light, and, I hope, decreasing, I have felt at liberty to give up a good deal of time to the Peace movement. I sent thee, some time since, a copy of the “Herald of Peace,” with a tolerable account of the proceedings of the Peace Congress at Brussels. I hope to send thee, next week, an account of our meetings in London, Birmingham, and Manchester. R. Cobden enters warmly into that part of the movement relating to Arbitration Treaties, and has consented to bring the question forward in Parliament early next session—probably in the shape of a motion for an address to the Crown, to instruct her foreign minister to negotiate arbitration treaties with the different Governments of Europe and America. From the manner in which Lord John Russell replied the other day to Elihu Burritt, when the deputation waited upon him from the Peace Congress, we think it not at all improbable that he will not oppose such a measure, if he does not positively support it, and the feeling of the public in this country is very ripe in its favour.’

The allusion to Lord John Russell is more fully explained in another letter to the same friend :—

‘I think I named to thee, in a former letter, that in the interview our deputation had with Lord John Russell, in

presenting to him the Peace Congress address, Elihu Burritt mentioned the fact that the United States Government had included, in their late treaty with Mexico, a clause by which all future differences should be left to arbitration; and Lord John's remark in reply was, as nearly as I can remember, in these words:—"If your (the American) Government will make a similar proposition to ours, it shall be taken into most serious consideration." Now, I observed upon this afterwards, that getting this remark from Lord John was, in my opinion, of itself worth all the trouble of the Congress, and urged Elihu Burritt to use all the exertions he could to induce your Government to make such a proposition. Now, I attach such immense importance to this point being pushed, that I do not think there is anything to which thou couldst devote a part of thy time that would more conduce to the benefit of the human family, and if thou couldst to put some machinery in motion to induce your Cabinet to take the matter into favourable consideration. Thou wilt of course be better able to judge than I am, both as to the practicability of doing this, and, if practicable, as to the best means of accomplishing it. I am the more anxious to see a movement in favour of this on your side of the water as soon as possible, because we are now exerting ourselves to bring all the public support we can to a motion which Richard Cobden has determined to bring forward, early next session, in favour of international arbitration. In a letter to me, R. Cobden says:—"If a sufficient pressure of opinion can be brought to bear upon the members, I do not see why the motion should fail even in the next session. The carrying it I should regard as the most important step ever taken in the direction of universal peace." We are trying to raise a fund of 5,000*l.* to defray the expenses of supporting the motion, and other matters arising out of the Peace Congress.'

To the same effect, writing to the Rev. John Clark of Jamaica in the early part of 1849, he says:—

'I find the Peace question occupy all the time I can spare,

and the public feeling appears so ripe for carrying it forward, that it seems as though one could, at the present moment, do as much or more to serve the human family in this direction as in any other.'

Again, referring to the second meeting of the Congress that was to be held in Paris, he writes to Mr. Tappan:—

'We are now looking forward to the Peace Congress in Paris next month. A large number of persons in England and Scotland have already expressed their intention of going. I hope the effect of it may be at least to turn the attention of the people a little more to a substitute for armed force in the settlement of international disputes. With all my love for an equality of political rights, it almost shakes my confidence in the good working of it when I contemplate the state of slavery in your land, and the sympathy of the free States with the slaveholders, and also the warlike spirit of the great bulk of your people. The leader of your armies in the atrocious war against Mexico seems about as popular among your citizens as our Duke of Wellington or the generals who have committed such wholesale slaughter in India and China are amongst our aristocracy. Indeed, I believe that, bad as we are, peace principles have made more progress in this country than in yours.'

One or two extracts from letters to Mr. Whittier shall conclude this selection. Under date of April 20, 1849, he writes to this friend:—

'Thou wilt probably have seen, from time to time, a little of our proceedings on the Peace question in this country, especially through Elihu Burritt and the "Christian Citizen." The motion of R. Cobden, on International Arbitration, has been deferred in the House of Commons through unavoidable circumstances; but it is becoming so popular in the country that I expect there will be a very respectable number of members voting for it. Elihu Burritt, and Henry Richard, the Secretary of the Peace Society, are gone to Paris to make

preparations for a Peace Congress to be held there in the eighth month. We are very anxious there should be a *good* delegation from the United States, and I hope thou wilt be one of them. I think the voyage would be very beneficial to thy health, and, besides other things, would probably amply repay thee for the trouble and sacrifice. As it is likely Lamartine will take a part in the Congress, and Richard Cobden has agreed to be present, the thing is becoming so popular here that it will be difficult, I expect, to limit the English delegation within moderate bounds. The prejudice between Englishmen and Frenchmen seems giving way rapidly, and to be replaced by a disposition to vie with each other as to which will show the greatest hospitality and kindness when they visit each other's countries.'

To the same friend he writes on April 5, 1850:—

'Although I believe I have acknowledged thy last welcome letter, yet I drop a line to enquire whether there is any chance of our seeing thee at the Frankfort Peace Congress. I understand that a goodly number are likely to come from the United States, and I shall be truly glad to see thee of the number, especially as I quite believe it would be a permanent benefit to thy health. Richard Cobden intends to bring forward two motions this session on the Peace question, one in favour of mutual disarmament, and the other a repetition of his motion last year on Arbitration. The Anti-slavery question in your country seems now the chief point of interest, and notwithstanding the shameful desertion of the cause by Daniel Webster, I cannot but feel a sanguine hope that its onward progress will not be arrested. Indeed, I think it has obtained too firm a hold of the national mind in the Northern States to be much injured even by such a man as Webster.'

CHAPTER XXI

MEDIATION BETWEEN DENMARK AND SCHLESWIG-HOLSTEIN.

Appearance of Dr. Bodenstedt at the Frankfort Peace Congress—His Proposal to that Body—Could not be entertained—Mr. Sturge determines to visit the Scene of War himself—Mr. E. Burritt and Mr. F. Wheeler accompany him—Nature of their Intervention—Journey to Kiel and Rendsburg—Interview with the Authorities of the Duchies—They accept the Principle of Arbitration—Mr. Sturge and his Companions proceed to Copenhagen—Interview with Count Molke, the Prime Minister—With the Baron De Reedtz, Foreign Secretary—Results of these Conferences—Visit to the Duke of Augustenburg—Conversation with the Duchess—Second Interview with the Authorities at Rendsburg—Hopeful Aspect of the Negotiation—But ultimately fails.

BUT out of the Congress held at Frankfort in 1850, there sprung an episode of a nature so peculiarly interesting, and one in which Mr. Sturge was so intimately concerned, as to demand a fuller record at our hands. At that time the question between Denmark and the Duchies of Schleswig-Holstein, which has since occasioned so much anxiety to Europe, had just been referred to the arbitrament of the sword. Hostilities had already actually commenced, and the two parties stood still confronting each other in battle array. Among the delegates who had come to Paris to represent Germany in the Congress of the preceding year, was Dr. Bodenstedt of Berlin, a gentleman who had already attained a considerable literary reputation in his own country, and had borne a rather prominent part in liberal politics in Prussia. On the third day of the sittings of

the Frankfort Congress, this gentleman appeared in the tribune with a document in his hand, signed by all the leading men of the constitutional party in Berlin as well as by the ambassador of Schleswig-Holstein in that city, entreating the Congress to appoint a commission of enquiry into the matters at issue between Denmark and the Duchies, with a view to a settlement of the case by arbitration. But among the standing orders of the Congress was one enjoining every speaker 'to avoid digressions to present political events.' This obliged the president to interpose before Dr. Bodenstedt could fully develop the proposal of which he was the bearer. Imperfect, however, as was the representation of his case which he was permitted to make, the few words he uttered were so touching, his whole aspect was so earnest, and his voice was so tremulous with deep emotion, that they reached the heart and brought tears into the eyes of not a few in that assembly. There can be no doubt that the Congress decided wisely in refusing in its corporate capacity to undertake a political mission of such extreme difficulty and delicacy as would have been an official mediation on its part between Denmark and the Duchies, especially at the solicitation of only one of the belligerent parties. Still, there were some of those present, conversant with all the circumstances of Dr. Bodenstedt's mission, who felt a painful degree of sympathy with his disappointment, and revolved the possibility of something being attempted, not indeed in the name of the Congress, but by any of the members in their private capacity, and acting solely on their own responsibility. Foremost among these was Mr. Sturge, whose heart yearned over the affecting picture of the miseries of that unnatural war which had been drawn by Dr. Bodenstedt. Mr. Elihu Burritt and the writer of

this memoir, having had much previous correspondence and intercourse with the doctor, strongly sympathised with Mr. Sturge.

The latter also received communications from two distinct and influential sources, strenuously encouraging the attempt of a private mediation. One of these gentlemen said, in a letter to Mr. Sturge :—

‘I have just had an interview with Dr. Bodenstedt, who gives me the fullest assurance, which he says he has high authority to give, that the leading men of Schleswig-Holstein would receive in the kindest manner, and would be willing to communicate with, any party of private English gentlemen, members of the Peace Congress, coming in the interests of peace and with the view to stop or suspend hostilities. He also desires that the Schleswig-Holstein ambassador in Frankfort (M. Von Stegman) should be called on, and he would provide those parties who are willing to undertake the errand of peace with the necessary information and with letters of introduction. The deputation, proceeding by way of Berlin, should also call on Dr. Bodenstedt. He would introduce them to the agents of the Schleswig-Holstein Government and to other influential people, who would give them every possible assistance. Nothing but good can proceed from such an attempt at practical peace making.’

Accordingly, a few days after the Congress, Mr. Sturge, Mr. Burritt, and Mr. Richard, accompanied by Dr. Var-rantrapp, the German secretary of the Congress and one of the most benevolent and generous-hearted of men, waited upon the ambassador of the Duchies of Schleswig-Holstein resident in Frankfort, in order to ascertain his views on the subject. This gentleman signified his readiness to do the utmost in his power to promote their object, and assured them that his Government would regard with the most favourable disposition their disinterested efforts for the restoration of peace. This

decided Mr. Sturge and his two friends to proceed at once through Berlin to Schleswig-Holstein, and should Providence seem to open the way, thence to Denmark. But duties of a very urgent nature connected with the Peace Society and the Peace Congress Society, to both of which he was secretary, obliged the biographer, at the last moment, very reluctantly to relinquish his purpose of accompanying the deputation. His place was therefore taken by Mr. Frederick Wheeler of Rochester, who by his intelligence and earnest sympathy with the object was well qualified to take part in the mission. It never entered into the minds of these gentlemen to offer *themselves* as mediators, or to pronounce any judgment whatever upon the matters in dispute between Denmark and the Duchies. Their sole object was to induce the belligerents to consent to submit the questions at issue to impartial and competent arbitrators to be mutually agreed upon by themselves. To obviate all misapprehension on this point they embodied their views in the following written statement, which they proposed to present to the two Governments as the whole ground and scope of their interference :—

‘ On the morning of the last session of the Peace Congress at Frankfort, a gentleman of high respectability from Berlin applied to the bureau for permission to read to the Congress a memorial signed by several distinguished individuals of that city. This memorial requested the Congress to investigate the merits of the controversy pending between the duchies of Schleswig-Holstein and the kingdom of Denmark. On consideration it was decided that the Congress could not enter upon such an investigation without violating one of the rules which it had adopted for the regulation of its proceedings, and which proscribed any direct allusion to the political events of the day. Nevertheless many of the members of the Congress, from different countries, were inspired with an

earnest desire that no favourable opportunity should be lost for interposing pacific counsels between the contending parties, with the hope of preventing the further effusion of blood and of promoting an amicable adjustment of the difference.

‘Entertaining this hope, and disclaiming all intention of entering into the merits of the case, the undersigned have ventured solely on their individual responsibility to proceed to the theatre of the contest for the purpose of entreating the contending parties to refer the whole question to the decision of enlightened arbitrators, and thus to spare themselves the further infliction of the calamities and horrors of a war which can never satisfactorily settle the matter in dispute, and which is contemplated with pain and sorrow by the friends of religion and humanity throughout the world.

‘Signed by JOSEPH STURGE, Birmingham, England.

ELIHU BURRITT, Worcester, United States.

FREDERIC WHEELER, Rochester, England.

They had a great advantage in making this appeal from the fact that in a treaty of alliance between Denmark and the Duchies, bearing date 1533, which was renewed in 1623, and confirmed at Tavendhall in 1700, there was a clause which provided that, ‘with respect to any differences that might arise between them they agreed to adjust them, *not* by means of arms, but by means of councillors, constituted as arbitrators, on the part of each, and disengaged from their oath of allegiance.’

The three ambassadors of peace, armed with no commission or authority from any human power, nevertheless proceeded on their way with that courage which a high faith inspires. They first presented themselves at Rendsburg, the principal fortress in Holstein, and then the seat of the executive of the Schleswig-Holstein Government, and were received by the stadtholders and other members of the Government with the utmost

courtesy and respect, and having secured their consent to the *principle* of referring the question in dispute to arbitration, they went on to Copenhagen. The Danish Government received them with no less respect and courtesy. Happily, we have in our possession very ample details of the journey, and of the interviews with the two Governments, in a series of letters which Mr. Sturge wrote to his own family. We are greatly mistaken if the extracts we are about to present from those letters do not deeply interest the reader.

JOURNEY TO KIEL AND RENDSBURG.

‘Klempenberg, near Copenhagen : September 6, 1850.

‘I have been so incessantly engaged since I left Berlin, and indeed I might say since I left home, that I have been unable to give even a brief outline of our journey and proceedings. I will, however, conclude, that up to the time we parted with our company at Cologne, thou wilt be fully informed of our proceedings either through Dickinson or our friends G. and A. M. Goodrich. I mentioned in former letters which I hope have reached thee, that after parting with our company we returned by steamer to Bonn to get a little rest, and also to see Joseph Newberg, who had urged us at Frankfort to proceed on this mission, and who, from being at Nottingham at the time of my contesting the election there with Walter, knew me by character. We spent several hours there with him, and he was to write to Berlin on the subject. I found this rest very refreshing, and on our return to Cologne that evening, we found Elibu Burritt and Henry Richard, and after consulting with them we parted with the latter, and started by railway for Berlin, by way of Dusseldorf, Hanover, Brunswick, Magdeburg, Brandenburg, and Potsdam. The distance is above 400 English miles, and we performed the journey in about twenty-four hours, including several rather long stoppages and change of carriages. We travelled in second class

carriages, which are quite equal and in some respects superior to English first class; but the practice of smoking is so universal in carriages of all classes, that a gentleman will not hesitate to light and smoke his cigar with a lady sitting opposite to him, and the latter evidently thinks it no act of rudeness or discourtesy. At Berlin a number of the military were stationed at the railway with fixed bayonets, which made them look rather formidable, to examine our passports. I had obtained one from Frankfort, and E. Burritt had one before; but F. Wheeler produced one a year or two old which rather puzzled the officer who examined it, but on producing his Peace Congress ticket it put all right, and we each received a ticket to pass the barrier into the city. All these things have now become very much a matter of form, but are very troublesome, and it was near eleven o'clock before we arrived at the Hôtel de Russie. We intended on first day (Sunday) to rest, and only to seek an interview with Dr. Bodenstedt. E. Burritt called upon him to let him know we were arrived. He appointed to come and see us at one o'clock, and in the meantime we read a chapter and sat down in silence together. We found there was no hope of keeping our mission secret, as a telegraphic message from the ambassador of the Duchies at Frankfort, announcing our intended visit, had already got into the Berlin papers. Dr. Bodenstedt had, before he came to us, seen several parties, and we were called upon by the ambassador from the Duchies, Baron Liliencron, the attorney-general of Berlin, Herr Von Holzendorff, and a Professor Forckhammer from Kiel; the latter could talk English, was well acquainted with a former correspondent in business of ours (now dead) of the name of Birch, who was the British consul there. As these gentlemen furnished us with all the information we wanted, letters, &c., and we were become, contrary to our wishes and intentions, objects of notoriety, we concluded to proceed at seven o'clock the next morning to Hamburg, notwithstanding a pressing invitation to meet a large party in Berlin the next day, but which we think our Berlin friends saw the propriety of our declining. The distance from Berlin to Hamburg is above 200 miles, but a railway all

the way brought us without change of luggage to the latter place a little before four o'clock; and we found, by getting to Altona by five o'clock, we could get to Kiel (the seat of the Duchies Government in time of peace) that night by railway, but understood that we must have an order from the commandant of Altona, which is within the territories of the Duchies, for permission to go. On arrival at his office we found he was not within, but we were assured we might proceed; and when we got to the railway-station Professor Worms came and spoke to us, guessing who we were, and said that he had had a telegraphic message from, I think, the ambassador at Berlin, the Baron Liliencron, to ask him to give us all the assistance in his power, and that though he had returned from Kiel that day, he was ready to accompany us at once there again. This was a great encouragement to us, as Professor Worms spoke English fluently, and was well acquainted with Geo. W. Alexander, and W. Forster, and Jno. Barry. We took, as usual, second class places, but found ourselves placed in first class alone with Professor Worms, who intimated that the director of the railway already knew our mission, and had done so to show his sense of it. We found that Professor Worms, being a German, was a zealous friend of the cause of the Duchies, and as he and his wife and friends had greatly exerted themselves in supplying the wounded, a great part of whom were placed at Altona, with linen, clothes, medicines, &c., he of course stood well with the authorities at Kiel and Rendsburg. On our road to Kiel, where we arrived about half-past eight o'clock, we had a pretty full opportunity of explaining to him our views and taking his advice, especially as regards the document which we had concluded to present both to the authorities of the Duchies and of Denmark, if we should go to and be received by the latter. He concurred in the propriety of drawing up such a paper, but that it should be confined to a simple recommendation of arbitration, and that we were right in declining to enter into the merits of the case with either party, and in assuming a strictly impartial attitude.

‘On arrival at Kiel we found the Baron Arnim, a friend of

Professor Worms, was going to Rendsburg early next morning. This is the strong fortress of the Duchies, and where the stadtholders reside during the war. We concluded to send by him our written statement, and a message to say we intended to wait upon them the following day (the fourth, this being the night of the second). The third day we employed before four o'clock in calling upon the president of the Assembly, the burgomaster, a number of the members of the Assembly, several merchants, one or two parties connected with the public press, &c., to whom, to prevent the possibility of any mistake as to the object of our mission, we generally read the document that we had sent to the stadtholder. We were in every case most cordially received, and though all the parties were exasperated in the highest degree at the conduct of the Danes, and appeared ready to shed, as they said, all their blood and treasure in defence of their rights, they were, without a single exception, willing to leave the matter to a fair arbitration before an impartial tribunal, and most of them expressed an earnest desire to get out of the hands of the diplomatists. This state of public feeling we think most important, as the Government is entirely dependent upon it for its power to act, and could only do so with the sanction of the assembly, which we found was to meet next week. Two or three members of the Assembly came to dine with us at our hotel. At four o'clock, one of them, a medical man of influence and eminence, who could talk English, after dinner took us to his country house, most beautifully situated, and introduced us to his wife and daughter, and afterwards took us in his carriage to an eminence from which we could distinctly see three Danish and three Russian men-of-war and a Russian war steamer cruising outside of Kiel harbour. I now come to the fourth day, the fourth instant, which, if it should lead to the termination of this lamentable war, we shall all look upon as the most eventful day of our lives. As we found we could go in a little *less* time through the country to Rendsburg in a land carriage than by the circuitous route by railway, we concluded upon the former, and started, accompanied by Professor Worms and an influential member

of the Assembly. Most of the country we passed through is fertile as well as highly cultivated, and as yet has altogether escaped the ravages of war. Many of the farm houses have evidently been built for ages, and it was melancholy to think that if this war could not be put a stop to, the scene of comfort and plenty through which we passed might shortly be converted into a desolate wilderness. There are some peculiar features I never saw before in the buildings on these small farms. The residence, the barn, the stables, and cowsheds are all under one roof, the entrance to the former as well as the latter being through the barn door. The whole is covered with a beautifully neat straw thatch, and on one end of the roof we often saw an enormous crane's nest, a bird which they shelter and protect as useful in the destruction of carrion, &c. It was agreed that we should call at a farm house on the way, both for the purpose of refreshing the horses and to give us an opportunity of seeing the interior, but when we stopped at the door, Professor Worms, who was on the box, found he had made a mistake as to the particular farm he meant to take us to. But the proprietor who came to the door received us not the less kindly, and at once showed us through his kitchen, dairy, barns, cowsheds, &c. Though he called the farm a small farm, it was, as well as I could gather, 340 acres, his own land. He kept ninety cows to make butter, which was churned by horse power, and all connected with the process was beautifully clean. While we were engaged in our inspection, the mistress of the family, who could talk a little English, had ordered the horses taken out to be fed, and had prepared us a second breakfast. She appeared a well educated and very clever woman, knew something of a daughter of our old acquaintance Birch, and seemed not a little pleased at the mistake which had brought us to their house.

INTERVIEW WITH THE SCHLESWIG-HOLSTEIN AUTHORITIES.

'We did not arrive at Rendsburg until after twelve o'clock. On getting within about two miles of it we came to some of the encampments. Most of the tents were made of wood and

straw—the latter said to be most comfortable. In one or two places the men were being exercised; in some others they were in an undress, amusing themselves. We were, I think, on three several occasions stopped to show our passports; but as we had a member of Assembly (who had then changed with Professor Worms) on the box with an official card, we were immediately allowed to pass. After passing the bridge into the fortress, we drove to an hotel in a large square opposite to the Government offices, and without much delay proceeded to the latter, accompanied by Professor Worms, who through mistake took us to a room at which neither servant nor sentinel was stationed, but on opening the door of which we saw the two stadtholders, Count F. Reventlow and Herr Besler; the Secretary of Foreign Affairs, Charles Francke; and General Krolme, the Secretary of War, together with the member of Assembly who had accompanied us from Kiel. Finding we had abruptly and unexpectedly opened the door, we drew back; but they requested us to walk in, and when we were seated, I was looked to for an explanation. I felt embarrassed, both by the novelty of my position and the great importance connected with this critical point of our mission; and after I had briefly and imperfectly stated our object, which the Minister of War, who could speak English, explained to the rest, I asked Professor Worms to read, in German, the statement we had prepared. E. Burritt and F. Wheeler and I then added some further remarks. E. B. especially alluded to the ancient treaty between them and the Danes, binding them to submit matters in dispute between them to arbitration. I told them that we should not have presumed to have presented ourselves before them but for the memorial from Berlin, and the conviction that we had the sympathy of the great majority of the Congress; that though we did not know how we might be received by the Danish authorities, we were wishing to proceed to Copenhagen, and hoped we should do no harm if we should do no good. After some conversation in German, the Minister of Foreign Affairs stated to us, in English, the substance of what is contained in the annexed memorandum, the accuracy of which, after it

was reduced to writing, was confirmed by him and both the stadtholders.* At the conclusion of the interview, the stadtholder Beseler requested Professor Worms to say, on behalf of himself and his colleagues, that they were anxious to assure us that, though he and his colleagues had replied somewhat cautiously to our suggestion, yet they fully appreciated the "meritorious motives" which had led to our visit. On taking leave, he asked us to dine with them at three o'clock—an invitation we felt that we could not refuse. In the anteroom, before dinner, we were introduced to the Duke of Augustenburg and his eldest son. The former is the uncle of the King of Denmark, and the latter the heir of the crown after his father, in case of the death of the present king and an elder uncle, both of whom have no children. At dinner the stadtholder requested me to sit next to the duke, who was in full uniform. He had been to England thirty years ago, and could speak English tolerably well. The Government of his nephew, the present King of Denmark, have taken possession of his domains in the island of Alsen, sold his favourite stud of horses, and removed his plate to Copenhagen. He and the duchess and their family have removed to the neighbourhood of Hamburg, and he gave me a cordial invitation to come and see them there. The company, which consisted of about twenty-five, was a striking and interesting one. On my right sat a professor from Berlin, who could talk English, and to whom, in answer to some question, I endeavoured to explain, as well as to one or two others who understood English, my views on the Christian ground of the unlawfulness of war and the inviolability of human life. The duke also noticed my refusal to take wine, and I had an opportunity of explaining our reasons for doing so. To show the

* 'M. Francke stated to the effect, that it was quite impossible for the Government of the Duchies to make any proposition, and that we must distinctly understand that we had no mission from them to the Danish Government. The stadtholder (M. Beseler) then stated, that they should be willing to refer the claims of the Duchies to the decision of enlightened and impartial arbitrators, provided Denmark would also submit *its* claims to the same tribunal, reserving for eventual arrangement the appointment, composition, and jurisdiction of the court.'

lamentable nature of this unnatural war, a gentleman who sat opposite to me at table was the *brother* of the general of the Danish army, while he had four sons in the Holstein army; so that, if this war is not put a stop to, some of them will probably be killed in battle by orders given by their own uncle—a case similar to my giving orders to shoot Charles's or Edmund's children! Indeed, I am told that there are brothers of the *same* family in each army; and yet it was but too evident that, from the highest to the lowest, the Holsteiners are anxious for another battle, and to die rather than be beaten. The only Englishman we met at dinner there, I am sorry to say, seemed trying to inflame this feeling. He spoke of the "infernal Danes;" and when I parted with him, said, by the time we returned from Denmark, it was likely they would be "at it again," meaning another battle. They wished us to see more of the camps and the army before we returned; but it was too late for this, and a member of the Government and one of the members of Assembly rode before us on our return through all the points guarded by soldiers where we were likely to be stopped, and parted with us in the most cordial manner. We returned to Kiel with Professor Worms, but did not arrive there until after midnight. We found that, by posting yesterday across the country to Stravemünde, we might possibly catch the boat from Lubeck to Copenhagen. This we resolved to attempt to do; and, after parting with Professor Worms early yesterday morning, we started for that purpose, but, from the badness of the roads and the slow driving, we found we should be too late unless we could increase the speed. This we succeeded in doing by offering a double fee to the driver, and happily arrived about a quarter of an hour before the boat started, which we found a very good and commodious one; and as the weather was fine, with very little wind, I went to bed very early, and had more sleep than on shore for many nights past. We arrived here about ten o'clock, and though, as we expected, we are placed in quarantine for five days, it is allowed to reckon from the time we started; and is in such a beautiful spot on the seaside, with sufficient food and comfortable accommo-

dation, that we have been amused to hear our colleague, E. Burritt, say that he should like to stop here to get up his writing, &c. I might perhaps say so, too, if I had no one at home I was anxious to see. We have forwarded a letter to the English ambassador to ask him to try to get us released; but if he does not, as we get liberated by third day in course, and we shall not lose more than two or three days by it, as first day intervenes. There are about forty of us in similar circumstances; and in the boat we came on shore in, though containing only twelve passengers, there were seven different nations represented.

‘Very affectionately, thy

‘J. S.

‘Notwithstanding the rapidity of our progress, we find a knowledge of our mission has gone here before us, and we have reason to believe we shall be most courteously received by the Danish Government.’

INTERVIEW WITH THE DANISH MINISTERS.

‘Copenhagen : 9 mo : 16, 1850.

‘I forwarded a letter from here on the 11th instant, and at eleven o'clock that day we had an interview alone with the Prime Minister, the Count A. W. Molcke, for more than half an hour, when I read to him a statement we had previously drawn up of our reasons for asking the interview, including the outline of the result of our visit to Kiel and Rendsburg, and the reply of the Government of the Duchies. I stated that though those we called upon seemed determined to resist force by force to the last extremity, they all, without a single exception, were ready to leave the whole matter in dispute to fair and impartial arbitration; quoted the former treaty between Denmark and the Duchies, binding them to refer all disputes between them, not to the decision of the sword, but to arbitration; and concluded by saying that “though we came as private individuals, connected with no political authority, we knew that we represented the convictions and sympathies of

millions, both on this and the other side of the Atlantic, and we entreated the Danish Government, in the name of our common Christianity, to arrest the further slaughter of those to whom God had united them, not only by the ties of the universal brotherhood of man, but also by close affinity of neighbourhood, and whom they even considered as their own countrymen. We earnestly appealed to them to put an end to this unnatural and deplorable war, and to accept a mode of settlement which shall recognise and establish the just rights of both parties, and heal the breach which the sword had made between them." I had felt so anxious about the result of this interview, and saw how much depended upon it, that I was quite overcome with emotion before I finished, and felt a difficulty in reading over two of the last sentences distinctly; but, perhaps on that very account, it did not produce the less effect upon the minister. Afterwards Elihu Burritt and Frederic Wheeler addressed him. In reply he assured us of the anxious desire of Denmark for peace with Holstein, and appealed to a proposition they had made to constitute a fair tribunal from Holstein, Schleswig, and Denmark, to settle the question amicably. We still urged a reference to impartial arbitrators not natives of either country, making use of all the arguments that occurred to us in favour of it. He by no means put a negative upon our proposition, appeared deeply interested, and I thought somewhat touched and affected by our visit, thanked us for it with apparent cordiality, and before we parted, intimated that we must look rather to the Minister of Foreign Affairs than to him for an answer. We left with him the papers I had read, to show to his colleagues if he thought fit. We afterwards saw Professor David, who evinced a deep and increasing interest in our mission, and intimated when we parted that he would go and see the Prime Minister, and probably the Minister of Foreign Affairs, before the latter saw us in the evening. Punctually at half-past seven o'clock we went to the Hotel of the Foreign Minister, who at once received us, and seated us with himself at a round table. On my proposing to read the same statement which I had to his colleague in the morning, he said

that he had seen it and read it, and it was therefore not necessary. I then said that perhaps he would allow my friends to offer a few observations, on which F. Wheeler made some remarks on the lamentable consequences of a continuance of the war, and the advantages of an amicable termination of it. This was followed up with earnestness by Elihu Burritt at some length; after which De Reedtz, the minister, said that before he went into the question as related to the Government, he wished to say a few words in reference to himself personally. He had, after being in public life for many years, retired with the wish and intention of never entering it again, and he should have preferred, to being in the position he now occupied, following his scientific pursuits; that he had taken his present office solely with the hope of securing peace; that he had three several times been a party to negotiations for the purpose, but that they had failed. But he assured us, in the most earnest and apparently sincere manner, that he was still ready to make any reasonable sacrifices to obtain it. He admitted all the evils we had stated as connected with the war in which brother was engaged against brother, father against son, and the dreadful evils which it engendered in the mutual hatred which increased the longer the war continued, and would be transmitted for ages to come; in fact, that it was likely to be the ruin of both countries, and that the successful party might be the one who had the last dollar to spend. This and other things of the same kind he said with an earnestness of manner that we could not doubt his sincerity. He then, on behalf of the Government, pointed out the different abortive efforts they had made to stop the war; heard all the arguments we wished to urge on him to adopt the course we proposed; said that Denmark, even now, was disposed to concede even a part of her just claims rather than the war should proceed; that he would consult his colleagues the next day on our proposition (which he did not put a negative upon); and if he had anything favourable to communicate, would let us know. We were with him more than an hour, and after leaving him we concluded that we must, if possible, get a

definite answer either for or against our proposition, and the next morning sent him a letter to say (after thanking him for our reception and the assurance of his anxiety for peace) that as, after we left Copenhagen, we should feel it our duty to publish the result of our mission, and wished to do strict justice to all parties, we should be obliged by a reply whether the Danish Government took the responsibility of rejecting our proposition or not. A verbal message came back, saying we should have a reply. At this time Professor David was with us, and we found that he had dined the day before with the ministers, that the Prime Minister and the Secretary of Foreign Affairs had had a long consultation, apparently in reference to our communication; and when we told him of what had occurred at the interview of the night before, and that, as we had now done all we could, we had written for a definite answer, he seemed deeply anxious that this answer should not be in the negative. He then left us to go and see the minister himself. An hour or two after he was gone we received a letter from the latter, appointing nine o'clock the next morning to see us again at his hotel. Finding we had all the afternoon to spare, we accepted an invitation of the American minister (who is become extremely interested in our mission, and most anxious to help us) to go by railway with him to Roskilde, where we were out of the observation of the public at Copenhagen, and spent a few hours most pleasantly in looking at the old cathedral, wandering about the beautiful suburbs, and afterwards taking tea together. We got back between ten and eleven o'clock.

• • • • •

‘We are just returned from the Minister of Foreign Affairs. During this interview the minister stated that he could not send us a written reply, as such writing would become a public document. Further, on behalf of himself and his colleagues, he had to say that, although they could not officially accept the proposed mode of settlement, yet they wished it to be distinctly understood that they did by no means reject it, and assured us that if the proposal were forwarded to them in an official and tangible shape, the

Danish Government would take it into its immediate consideration, with every disposition towards its acceptance, and without being tenacious as to the form in which, or the channel through which, it might be forwarded. In reply to a question, he said that it need not have the publicity of being discussed and voted in the *Landsversammlung*. E. Burritt stays here, and F. Wheeler and I start at two o'clock by steamboat to Lubeck for Hamburg and Kiel. It is desirable that our communication with the Danish Government, at least for the present, should not be made public. As we think the matter of time of great importance, as another battle may take place every day, we still think it our duty to travel to-morrow, and I hope to be in Hamburg before six o'clock in the evening, from whence I intend to post this. We communicate with the Danish minister here in future through Professor David, who, he says, has his confidence. This, we think, will be an important aid towards a successful result.'

INTERVIEW WITH THE DUCHESS OF AUGUSTENBERG.

'Hamburg: 9th mo: 18, 1850.

'This morning we had another interview with Professor Worms, but we did not elicit from him that the visit of the two gentlemen from Kiel yesterday had any special reference to our mission; and as our arrival had been announced in the newspapers, and I had given the Duke of Augustenburg reason to expect I would call on my return, if I could make it convenient, F. Wheeler and I rode over there this morning—a distance of four or five miles from our hotel. He was not at home; but while talking to the footmen at the door, a gentleman whom we had seen at Kiel came out, and the duchess herself appeared at the door almost immediately afterwards. This upset our intention of only leaving our cards in case of the duke's absence. We had no sooner entered the door than we were met also by her three daughters; and the whole party, all of whom could speak English, gave us the most cordial welcome, and were evidently and

naturally anxious to know what we could communicate. We were sorry and somewhat embarrassed that we had so little we could tell them, and hardly felt at liberty even to tell them the whole of that, though their open and artless manners were calculated to put us much at ease. The duchess, who could not speak English quite so fluently as her daughters, told us that to-day was the thirtieth anniversary of her marriage, showed us a plate of their palace in the island of Alsen, from which they had now been exiled three years, and which one of her daughters said had been pillaged by the Danes; also a picture of her husband and two sons, who were absent; and lastly, with evident emotion, she unrolled a plan with the whole family group, and several interesting scenes of apparently past family history; expressed an anxious wish that we should again visit them on the return of her husband, who was gone to Kiel or Rendsburg, and asked us whether we would allow the gentleman who met us at the door to call on us at the hotel, evidently with the hope that we could give them some more information on the return of Elihu Burritt, who, we told them, we shortly expected. The daughters spoke English so well that I thought they must have been to our country; but I found they had not, though they had a great desire to go. While we were there a carriage drove up to the door, and a gentleman and lady came in, whom the duchess introduced as the Duke and Duchess of Glucksburg. The former was dressed in military uniform, and could not speak English. We soon afterwards left; but the duchess came out with us to the door, and warmly thanked us for calling. Though these incidents are pleasant and interesting ones connected with our mission, I feel sorely tried at our detention here, but see clearly that we cannot properly leave until after E. B.'s return.'

SECOND INTERVIEW WITH THE SCHLESWIG-HOLSTEIN AUTHORITIES.

'Kiel: 9th mo: 23, 1850.

'We arrived here about eleven o'clock, and found a gentleman at the station waiting to take us at once to M. Francke,

the Minister of Foreign Affairs for Schleswig-Holstein. On our arrival he received us very cordially, and sat down at a table with us, two other gentlemen being present. I briefly introduced the subject, and then read the written statement which we had given to the Danish Government. I then told him that my friend E. Burritt, whose memory was better than mine, would give him the substance of what had passed verbally. E. Burritt then gave a full and clear outline of the most important part of the interviews, especially those which led us to the firm belief that De Reedtz, the Minister of Foreign Affairs for Denmark, when speaking on behalf of the Government, was sincere in his desire to settle the question amicably, and to meet favourably the proposition to arbitrate, and concluded by stating that, in consequence of our interviews with Professor Worms at Hamburg, F. Wheeler and I had remained there and written back to him to get the principle of arbitration recognised precisely in the same shape that the Duchies had, and his having succeeded in doing so. He was evidently deeply interested in the statement, and at the close of it I read to him our ideas of what the arrangements might be for the appointment, composition, and jurisdiction of the Court of Arbitration. He said that, as their Assembly was about to meet (at twelve o'clock), he could not now give us an answer.

'We at once told him that the subject was of such paramount importance that we would stay over to-morrow. He asked to have our written papers, and made some observations in reference to the constitution of the Court which convinced us that it would be seriously entertained by himself and his colleagues. He invited us to attend the sitting of their Assembly, where we have been for about an hour; and on coming out, the Minister of Foreign Affairs came to me at the door and said he hoped to meet us at our hotel to dinner to-day at four o'clock. It is now between two and three, and as the post goes out at four o'clock, I cannot give any more of our present visit to Kiel. A number, apparently, of fresh recruits for the Holstein army came part of the way

from Altona in the same train with us on their road to Rendsburg. They appeared in a state of excitement, though, I believe, quite sober, and one of them was very near getting under the engine of another train which met us.

‘Very affectionately, thy
‘J. S.’

Up to this point the intervention of our volunteer ambassadors of peace had proceeded auspiciously. The two Governments had gone so far as to appoint a sort of unofficial negotiator on each side—Professor David, of Copenhagen, on the part of Denmark, and Professor Samwer, of Lubeck, on the part of the Duchies—to confer as to the character and constitution of the proposed Court of Arbitration. At that time Chevalier Bunsen, who was Prussian ambassador in this country, told Mr. Cobden that he had a stronger hope of a satisfactory adjustment of the matter in dispute from that pacific embassy than from all that had been done before by the professional diplomatists of Europe. Unhappily, however, these latter interposed at the critical moment. In a document addressed to the members of the Peace Congress, which Messrs. Sturge, Burritt, and Wheeler published after their return, giving an account of their mission, they say—‘We have great confidence that those with whom it now rests will be able to bring the matter to a speedy and successful conclusion. . . . If such an arrangement be *not* now effected we believe that it will be mainly attributable to the interference of the great European Powers, contrary to the wish of one of the contending parties, as indicated in the London Protocol of the 2nd of August—a document which has excited strong dissatisfaction in the minds of the in-

habitants of the Duchies.' How far 'the great European Powers' disposed of the question in a satisfactory manner, the world has ample opportunity of judging by the light of the deplorable events now taking place in the north of Europe.

CHAPTER XXII.

THE RUSSIAN WAR.—VISIT TO ST. PETERSBURG.

The Industrial Exhibition of 1851—Its pacific Tendency—Mr. Sturge's Receptions at Hyde Park—The *Coup d'État* and the Empire in France—The Invasion Panic in England—Efforts of the Peace Party to oppose it—The Eastern Question—Sudden Change of the Public Feeling—Outcry against Russia—Mr. Sturge's sorrowful Apprehension of War—A Visit to the Emperor of Russia is proposed—Minute of the Society of Friends—Mr. Sturge and his Companions start for St. Petersburg—Account of the Journey—Sledge-travelling—A Misadventure on the Road—Arrival at St. Petersburg—Interview with Count Nesselrode—Sights of the City—Appointment to see the Emperor.

THE Industrial Exhibition of 1851, by bringing the nations who had been accustomed to meet only in the fierce conflicts of the battle-field into friendly rivalry with each other in the arts of peace, was felt to be an event eminently favourable to the object which the friends of peace had at heart. The Peace Congress, held that year in London, was therefore singularly appropriate, and seemed to give a fitting expression in living speech to the sentiment of which the Crystal Palace and its contents were the significant material symbol. Mr. Sturge, anxious to avail himself of that propitious season to promote the various philanthropic enterprises in which he was interested, had taken a house at Hyde Park, where he gave a succession of 'receptions,' to which the representatives of different nations were invited. One was devoted to the Peace cause, another to Anti-slavery, a third to Temperance,

and so on with other topics. There, with all the freedom of social converse, good men of different creeds and countries conferred as to the best modes of combating the great evils which afflict the world, and of aiding, by such services as it was in their power to offer, the gracious designs of Providence towards the human race. It cannot be doubted, that from these conferences many a one derived new impulse to spend and be spent in the cause of humanity.

Hitherto the Peace movement had been, on the whole, prosperous and progressive. Attended ever, no doubt, by a sharp comment of criticism from many quarters, which was a good discipline and prevented their enthusiasm from running to seed, its promoters found ample encouragement for their efforts. A deeper sense of the enormity of war was growing up everywhere in the heart of Christian nations. A kindlier feeling was rapidly gaining ground between different countries, especially between England and France. Friendly visits were exchanged by large bodies of the people, who began to discover that those whom they had been taught to regard as 'natural enemies,' were in truth very much men of like affections with themselves. There seemed a prospect, not indeed of a sudden millennium of peace, but of a steady increase of mutual respect and good-will among nations, and of the growth of a public opinion, under the pressure of which Governments might be obliged to seek for some more rational means of settling their differences than by recourse to the sword, and some less ruinous method of preserving peace than by an insane rivalry in armaments, which, far from contributing to that end, only kept their respective countries in a normal condition of disquietude and alarm. One would have

thought that these were results which none would be found to deplore and deprecate. Yet, undoubtedly, there were some who looked upon them with a sinister and angry eye, and were determined to leave no effort untried to counteract them. The Peace men were assailed with extreme vehemence. A constant fire of irritating charges and insinuations was kept up against France. Philosophical reasoning was also put in requisition. The country was solemnly warned that the people were in danger of becoming enervated by the luxury which the long continuance of peace and prosperity had introduced—a danger which did not seem very imminent when we consider that ‘the people,’ from whom the army was recruited, were for the most part agricultural labourers, whose effeminating luxuries were such as nine or ten shillings a week could purchase. But circumstances came to the help of this class of persons. At the close of 1851, the *coup d'état* took place in France. In November 1852, the empire was reconstituted in the same country. These two events were taken advantage of to work the public mind up into a state of mingled terror and rage bordering on frenzy. Without one single fact on which to build such a conclusion, except that the man who had attained to supreme power in France was a Bonaparte, it was assumed as a settled thing, which none but a simpleton or a traitor could doubt, that there was to be immediate war against England, and that not in the ordinary way to spring out of some misunderstanding between the two Governments—for there was absolutely no question of any kind in dispute—and to be preceded by some show at least of diplomatic negotiation, but in the form of a sudden piratical descent by our neighbours upon our coasts for mere

purposes of pillage and revenge. Tales of the wildest description, tending to show that active preparations were being made on the other side of the Channel for an invasion of this country, were circulated by the newspapers and implicitly believed by thousands. And while these atrocious designs were ascribed to the Emperor, the whole vocabulary of vituperation was emptied on his head day by day. The Peace party, with Mr. Cobden at their head, threw themselves into the breach to stem this torrent of folly, and straightway the wrath of the assailants was directed against them with a violence second only to that wreaked on the French and their ruler. Their exertions, nevertheless, did no doubt greatly contribute to check the panic and to calm the public mind. But such incessant appeals to the passions of the people as were now made by the War party, could not fail ultimately to produce effect. The slumbering spirit of strife was being more and more stirred into life by these loud incantations. The gradual change thus wrought in the temper of the nation was viewed by Mr. Sturge with inexpressible sorrow.

Throughout the storm of obloquy which broke upon the head of the Peace party for opposing the invasion panic, he had been working with more than ordinary energy in the interests of peace. 'I have been overwhelmed,' he says to Mr. Tappan, on Feb. 28, 1853, 'with engagements in trying to stop this war-cry in our country.' And again, to the same friend within a few days of the same date :—

'Thou wilt probably get by the same packet a Manchester paper with a full account of the proceedings of the Peace Congress there last week. I hope and believe that this conference and the pamphlet of Richard Cobden will do some—

thing to check the continued abuse of the French by the London press. That they are producing an effect is evident from the tirade of abuse with which they assail R. Cobden. We have a good deal of confidence in Lord Aberdeen. In 1849 he expressed his opinion in a very decided manner in reference to the great increase of European armaments. Whether he may have the will or the power to act upon it, now that he is Prime Minister, is very uncertain.'

But suddenly there was a change in the direction sought to be given to the hostile feeling of the nation. While the French invasion panic was at its height, the Eastern question, as it was called, began gradually to loom into notice. And forthwith the alarmists quitted the Emperor of the French and turned, with an abruptness that would have been ludicrous if it had not involved such serious consequences, to bait the Emperor of Russia. All the invectives so recently showered on the former were now lavished without stint upon the latter; while he who had been the bugbear of 1853 was all at once, in 1854, taken into high favour as 'our gallant and loyal ally.' There were many things, no doubt, concurring to produce the fierce excitement against Russia that soon culminated into a tempest of passion which defied all the restraint of reason and justice. There were very exaggerated notions abroad as to the growing power of that empire; coloured maps were published showing the additions made to her territories within the last hundred years—a matter of complaint which came with a singularly ill-grace from a nation which, during the same period, had probably added four times more territory to her own dominions. Strange as it may seem, there was combined with this a most contemptuous opinion of her capacities and resources as a military power. A

generous, if not very intelligent, sympathy with Poland as an oppressed nationality had also aided to swell the tide of indignation against Russia, while the part she had so recently taken in the suppression of Hungarian independence had been pressed upon the public mind with extraordinary vividness and power by the eloquent diatribes of Kossuth. Added to this was a complete ignorance as to the real state of Turkey, and especially the oppressed and miserable condition of its Christian population. But, perhaps, what more than all tended to raise the war-feeling to so ungovernable a pitch was the unexampled prosperity which had flowed in upon the nation as the result of free trade. 'Jeshurun waxed fat and kicked.'

But be the causes what they may, appearances grew so menacing, even towards the middle of 1853, as seriously to alarm those interested in the preservation of peace. Thus we find Mr. Sturge writing to Mr. Tappan, July 8, 1853:—

'We are here in much uneasiness as to whether this Russo-Turkish affair may not lead to a European war. What strangely inconsistent beings professing Christians are! A few months ago Louis Napoleon was held up as a monster in human shape, and we were put to great expense to prepare against the pretended danger, that he and his people would turn pirates, and suddenly come over to murder and rob us. Now we are uniting our fleet with that of this very monster to fight with the Turks against a professedly Christian country, whose Emperor tells us that he has no object of conquest in view, but solely the protection of his fellow-Christians from the persecutions of those Turks whom English and French Christians are so ready to fight for.'

A few months later, Jan. 13, 1854, he writes again:—

'We are feeling very anxious about the question, or rather we must now say the war, between Russia and Turkey. There

is but too great reason to fear that it may end in a European war; and I am sorry to say that what is called the Liberal party in this country seem the most anxious to promote it. There are even Dissenting ministers who are trying to push on our Government to hostilities, and are blaming Lord Aberdeen for his endeavours to preserve peace.'

The feeling of anxiety of which he speaks in this letter grew very oppressive to Mr. Sturge's mind as events became more and more threatening. Writing at the beginning of 1854 to Rev. John Clark, he says:—

'I am glad to hear that your Educational Bill is dropped, and that there is a more cheerful spirit in the community. I trust that brighter days are before you. But, alas! if I am to judge by what is passing here, we are little qualified to bear either national or individual prosperity. No sooner does Providence smile upon us in this way than we rush headlong into what, I fear, will prove one of the most bloody, as it is one of the most uncalled-for wars in which England has ever engaged. Whatever may have been the conduct of Russia towards Turkey, our aggressions in India and China have far exceeded it in enormity; and it appears to me as though the conduct of our rulers in getting us into this war is intended by Providence as a judgment for our national crimes, especially in those countries. But such are the mysterious dispensations of Providence, that those who are most guilty in promoting war are seldom those who suffer most by it. Such is the gloomy aspect of things here that I feel greatly discouraged, and fear all that is good will be thrown back half a century.'

But Mr. Sturge was not a man to rest satisfied with lamentations. The impulse of his nature was ever to ask—Can anything be done? The Peace party had done all that it was possible for them to do at home. Facing the unpopularity and odium which assailed

those who dared to withstand the delusion of the hour, they had steadfastly pleaded, both in and out of parliament, in favour of moderation and peace. But, in December 1853, while Mr. Sturge was in earnest conversation with his friend Mr. Joseph Cooper, in London, who had been long and intimately associated with him in many of his philanthropic labours, the idea was started whether some good might not be effected by a deputation from the Society of Friends waiting upon the Emperor of Russia. It was obvious enough, from the actual temper of the nation, that there was no hope of conciliatory counsels from our side. But was it not possible that the single mind which controlled the destinies of Russia might prove more accessible to influence than the millions of minds at that moment inflamed by prejudice and passion which ruled the policy of England? And might not a respectful and earnest appeal on grounds of humanity and religion from a body of Christian men known to bear no political character, and addressed to the heart of the man rather than to the pride of the monarch, accomplish something of what the angry remonstrances of diplomacy, backed by menacing demonstrations of force, had failed to effect? Such were the questions which Mr. Sturge and his associates asked. After private consultation with a few more Friends, the matter was submitted to what is called the Meeting for Sufferings—a sort of standing committee which represents the Society of Friends during the intervals of its yearly meetings.* This body, after very serious and prayerful deliberation, adopted the suggestion, and it was in their

* In the early history of the Society, when persecution was the heritage of every Quaker, 'the Meeting for Sufferings' arose out of the exigencies of the times; its objects being to relieve Friends who were

name and as their representatives that the three gentlemen constituting the deputation, Mr. Sturge, Mr. Henry Pease, and Mr. Robert Charleton, went on the mission to Russia. It is often said that they were sent by the Peace Society. But the Peace Society had nothing to do with the appointment except cordially to wish God speed to the good and brave men that had undertaken it. It was strictly a religious mission, springing from a religious body, and proceeding altogether upon religious grounds, as will appear from the following minute adopted by the meeting to which we have already referred :—

‘At a Meeting, representing the Religious Society of Friends, held in London, the 17th of 1st month, 1854.

‘This meeting has been introduced into much religious concern in contemplating the apparent probability of war between some of the nations of Europe. Deeply impressed with the enormous amount of evil that invariably attends the prosecution of war, and with the utter inconsistency of all war with the spirit of Christianity and the precepts of its divine Founder as set forth in the New Testament, this meeting has concluded, under a strong feeling of religious duty, to present an address to Nicholas, Emperor of Russia, on this momentous question; and it also concludes to appoint Joseph Sturge, Robert Charleton, and Henry Pease, to be the bearers of this address, and, if the opportunity for so doing be afforded, to present the same in person.

‘In committing this service to our dear brethren, we crave for them, in the prosecution of it, the help and guidance of that wisdom which is from above; and we commend them,

prisoners, to make representations to the King, the Government, or Parliament, and generally to help and succour the victims of persecution. Hence its name, and though the duties of this ‘meeting’ have changed, it is a proof of how real a thing that name implied that it should have been thus perpetuated to this day.

as well as the cause entrusted to them, to the blessing of Almighty God.

‘Signed in and on behalf of the meeting by

‘SAMUEL FOX,

‘Clerk at this time.’

We shall permit Mr. Sturge to tell the story of that journey in his own simple words, as they were written from day to day in familiar letters to his family, supplementing what, in one or two places, seems defective by communications with which we have been kindly favoured by one of his colleagues in the mission, Mr. Robert Charleton.

The deputation started from London on January 20, 1854, and, passing through Berlin, Königsberg, and Riga, reached St. Petersburg on February 2.

‘Petersburg: 2nd mo: 2, 1854.

‘Although, as thou mayst suppose, somewhat wearied with our journey, I wish just to commence a letter to say we arrived here about seven o’clock this evening, and are located at Miss Benson’s, on the English quay, as comfortably as we could have been at almost any hotel in England. We are all in good health, and have got on far better than, from the state of the roads, we could have anticipated, and have met with as much civility and attention as if we had been subjects of the Emperor of Russia himself. As we had mostly to employ six, and on one occasion seven horses, from the heavy drifts of the snow in some parts of the road, we calculate we have had the help of upwards of 200 Russian horses to bring us here, at the low charge of about three halfpence per mile for each horse, and have reason to be very thankful so far that we have not met with any mishap worth notice. We have come with our carriage on a sledge all the way from Riga, and the latter has proved so strong, and the former so firmly secured to it, as to stand, without any material injury, all the shocks of our journey.’

H H

' Petersburg: 2nd mo: 4, 1854.

' I wrote by last post, briefly mentioning our arrival here, &c. We were detained in Riga nearly four hours longer than we intended, in consequence of the breaking of a part of our travelling apparatus in fixing the carriage to the sledge (and which in England would probably have been put right in half an hour), so that we did not leave Riga until after two o'clock in the afternoon. We went to the Government office in that city by appointment at ten o'clock, where our passports were exchanged for another document, which amongst other things described our persons, and also contained instructions, in English, of how we were to proceed on our arrival in Petersburg. The number of conveyances in Riga, principally sledges, many of them elegantly fitted up, far exceeds anything I had seen in any city of the size before. In the street opposite our hotel, it was often as crowded as Cheapside, and as each owner of a sledge is obliged to have one or more bells on his horse or horses, there was a continual jingle not only in the day but through the night. It seems singular that in this cold climate almost all the middle classes *ride* even short distances, and the ladies in an open drosky, with apparently as little covering as they use in walking in England, while the gentlemen not only ride but walk in their fur coats. After we had proceeded two stages with four horses, during which the snow continued to fall, we had to take six horses; and towards eleven o'clock it fell so heavily that even our courier began to think it might be safest to stop at the next posting station for fear of being blocked up in the road. However, towards midnight it abated, and with an extra horse one stage we got on through the night, and the following day with six horses, we travelled at the rate of from six to eight miles an hour, losing from fifteen to forty minutes at the different stations, which are at the average distance of about twenty Russian versts, or about fourteen miles. We were agreeably surprised to find these stations, instead of being worse, much better than before we arrived at Riga. They are handsomely built, and well furnished, and it is part of the regulations that the occupiers should keep them well

heated with stoves during the winter. The house, firewood, and furniture are provided by Government, and a part of the latter seems uniformly to be one or more pictures of the Emperor. The rooms for visitors seem generally well cleaned, but we soon had proof that it was not always the case with parts more out of sight. We arrived at Dorpat, where there is a University of about 600 students, about seven o'clock the second evening, and, thinking it would divide the distance better to Petersburg, we proceeded to the next posting-station, and found the sleeping accommodation really cleaner and better than at the hotel at Riga. We started between six and seven in the morning, and during a good part of the day passed along the north shore of the Lake Piepus, which was often in sight, but was for the most part enveloped in mist; in one place, however, we could see, I should suppose, not less than a hundred sledges passing along it, as being in some cases nearer as well as smoother than the road. The number of small sledges with one horse is great in this part of Russia. Sledges being the principal, and in the winter the only, means of transit for all kinds of produce and merchandise, we met or passed them at almost all hours of the night as well as day. Generally a considerable number of them go together, and there are large sheds on the road, not far from the posting-stations, in which the men and their horses can get under cover. While on the banks of the Piepus we had not unfrequently to pass through some rather deep drifts of fresh-fallen snow (more so, probably, from the sledges with produce and merchandise taking to the ice), and I was surprised to see how well six little horses, with our heavy sledge behind them, would pull through it, and come in comparatively fresh at the end of the stage, when English horses would probably have been knocked up with even a light weight behind them. We proceeded steadily, with an occasional great shake, until about one o'clock the next night, when, at a time when we were all nearly or quite asleep, our sledge suddenly descended, and, after appearing to be about to tip the carriage over, came to a dead stop and quickly roused us. Our driver was vainly urging on his

horses, and we escaped out of the door on the upper side as fast as we could. The vehicle had got into such a position that our efforts added to those of our six horses failed to move it. The driver at last thought of trying to put the horses to drag it into the common, away from the road, and in this he succeeded; and after taking a sweep through the snow he brought it back to the road again, without any damage except, I believe, a little straining of one of the springs of the carriage. A few hours after this, and when it had become daylight, we found our conveyance once more come to a stand still, and on getting out it proved to be occasioned by some of those undulations from the drifts of snow, which are described by William Allen and Stephen Grellet as producing the same effect on them as sea-sickness when their sledges passed over them. But in this case they were not sufficiently frozen to bear our heavy sledge. However, on our getting out, the horses dragged it along, and we proceeded without any serious interruption, the road improving and the snow becoming more beaten as we approached Petersburg. Our plan with meals has been to take our breakfast and tea at the posting-houses, where they find us good water and good milk, and use our own tea, coffee, cocoa, and biscuits or bread (some very good of the latter we bought at Riga and Königsberg). We take our dinner in the carriage, of bread, biscuits, raisins, and an apple, to which we added in Riga a tongue, a bit of beef, a little butter, and a little jar of preserves, which lasted us to Petersburg.

‘11 o’clock P.M.—We are just returned from a visit to W. C. Gillibrand, who gave us some private details of deep interest of the Royal Family of Russia, which, coming from an intelligent Christian Englishman who has resided here forty years with unusual means of information, may I think be relied upon, and which places the character of the present Emperor in a more favourable light than we have been wont to view it in England; but I must defer writing more at present, further than saying that we have prepared a note to Count Nesselrode, and W. C. Gillibrand has engaged to send it to him at ten o’clock to-morrow morning.’

Petersburg: 2nd mo: 8, 1854.

'We took two sledges the afternoon before yesterday, and went on the ice on the Gulf of Finland about half way towards Cronstadt, to what is called the half-way house, which is temporarily erected at a great distance from shore for the accommodation of passengers, and where they say there are sometimes not less than 200 sledges at one time, many of them heavily laden, yet without at all making the ice crack. It was quite dark before we got back, but there are long lines of posts, and watchmen at certain distances who ring bells to keep travellers in a right direction in case of a snow-storm or fog. Before this precaution was taken it was not uncommon for people to get lost, and there have been cases when persons not properly clothed have been frozen to death. Indeed, we have seen a gentleman who says he has sometimes been travelling on the ice below Cronstadt when a snow-storm came on, and he has remained out all night in his sledge.'

As one of Mr. Sturge's letters is missing—that containing an account of the interview of the deputation with Count Nesselrode—we are happy to be able to supply the omission by an extract from one of Mr. Charleton's letters:—

'2nd mo: 2.—Count Nesselrode had appointed to meet us at one, but sent us word that, in consequence of having business with the Emperor, he wished our interview postponed until half-past one. That he should thus send purposely to avoid keeping us waiting half an hour, we thought a rather striking mark of politeness. At the appointed hour we went, and having been shown through a long suite of rooms we were ushered into the count's private apartment, where he received us with great courtesy and affability. Joseph Sturge read the address to him, and some remarks were added. Count Nesselrode expressed his entire concurrence in the sentiments it contained, and his appreciation of the motives by which it was dictated. He said that

the Emperor, who had been apprised of our arrival, would be quite willing to allow us to present the address in a private interview, and that we should be informed as soon as a suitable time could be fixed. He referred to the intercourse of the late Emperor Alexander with our friends William Allen and Thomas Shillito, and himself added a reference to Daniel Wheeler. We have no reason to doubt the entire sincerity of the count's expression of satisfaction with our visit, as we are informed on good authority that he is personally very much opposed to war.'

We now resume our quotations from Mr. Sturge's letters:—

'Count Nesselrode has requested his private secretary to accompany us to see the most remarkable sights in the city, but I confess that my mind is too ill at ease with the prospect of the visit to the Emperor before us on which so much may depend, and at which it may be so important not to say too little or too much, to enjoy the most interesting sights, even if I had not very much outlived my curiosity in respect to such matters. But as Count Nesselrode, who is Chancellor of the Empire, the highest office of the state, had specially appointed this gentleman to show us anything we might like to see, it would have been discourteous to refuse. We have been to-day to what is called "The Hermitage," which is attached to the Winter Palace, where the Emperor and his family now reside, though it does not actually form part of it. We have spent about three hours there, and as Henry Pease observed when we left, if we could describe the beauty and magnificence of the place, which it would be scarcely possible to do, our friends would consider it an exaggeration. Of course we could only take a cursory view, though we probably walked a mile or more through galleries and rooms fitted up in the most costly, and at the same time the most chaste style. Some are devoted to medals and coins chiefly of gold or silver, and arranged according to the different countries to which they belong; others to statues ancient and modern; but the greater

proportion to pictures, different rooms being set apart for the artists of different nations. But what perhaps strikes most is the costly character of the furniture of the different suites of rooms, the richness and highly polished finish of the multitude of Italian marble pillars, generally of one single block, the beauty of the ceilings, &c. We are becoming rather unpleasantly objects of curiosity, and as it will get out that the Chancellor of the Empire has received us cordially and the Emperor has determined to receive the address, we shall become more so, and we shall be anxious to get out of the way as soon as we possibly can. We already find it difficult to refuse invitations without appearing uncourteous, though we have delivered scarcely any of our letters of introduction. We have consented to dine with A. Mirrielies, a friend of W. C. Gillibrand, to-morrow evening, and we are intending to go to see a school in which he is much interested to-morrow morning. I find the English gentlemen, and especially the ladies, have admitted pretty strongly anti-Russian feelings, and except where there is a very strong interest in favour of peace, I fear they would not be sorry to see England at war with this country; and if they say as much to the Russians as they do amongst themselves, it is not surprising that there should be, as they allege there is, an increasing anti-English feeling amongst the Russians. All parties, however, admit that the Emperor has qualities of private character which we in England do not give him credit for; that he is not only kind but affectionate in the private and domestic relations of life, and it is said on pretty good authority that he devotes nearly an hour daily to his private devotions.

'2nd mo: 9.—We have been to-day to see a school for the instruction of foreign residents in Petersburg, at which there are usually about 180 girls and 120 boys in attendance. We were much pleased with the order and cleanliness of the school, and, as far as we were able to judge, the progress of the children; but as they speak either German or Russian, I could judge of little more than the writing. It is under the care of Gillibrand and his friends, and is mainly supported by

voluntary subscriptions, to which the Emperor and his family contribute liberally. About 6,000 children have been educated there since its establishment. All born of Russian parents are brought up in connection with the Greek Church. We have been taken by the gentleman appointed by Count Nesselrode to attend upon us to see what is called the Mining Corps, which contains many curious and valuable specimens of the Mines of Siberia, models of the way in which the mines are worked, &c. He tells us we shall be informed to-night if the Emperor will see us to-morrow or not.

‘ 11 o’clock at night.—We have received a letter from Count Nesselrode, saying the Emperor had fixed half-past one to-morrow to see us, and asking us to be at his office at one. Of course, from this until the interview is over will be an anxious time for us all.’

CHAPTER XXIII.

INTERVIEW WITH THE EMPEROR OF RUSSIA.

Motives that prompted the Mission—The Address from the Society of Friends—Mr Charleton's Account of the Interview—The Emperor's Emotion—Interview with the Empress—The Emperor's Reply—His Request to the Deputation to postpone their Departure—Interview with the Grand Duchess of Leuchtenberg—Altered Aspect of Affairs—Arrival of the English Mail—Violent Speeches in Parliament—Effect of the Friends' Mission in England—Continued Kindness to the Deputation at St. Petersburg—Results of the Mission—Mistaken Notion of its Influence on the War—Unfounded Accusation against the Peace Party of having Occasioned the War—Its real Causes.

It is, of course, open to those who delight in referring all acts of high devotion to mean and ignoble motives, to say or insinuate that these three gentlemen, in quitting their families and undertaking, at such a season, a long and hazardous journey into those regions 'where winter barricades the realms of frost,' were actuated only by a love of notoriety, or a puerile passion for getting into contact with a crowned head. One thing is very certain, that no one who knew Joseph Sturge will accept that interpretation of the matter. The writer of this memoir saw him on the eve of his journey, and if ever man acted under a solemn, a religious sense of responsibility, he did so on that occasion. His heart had been long burdened, as his letters abundantly testify, with apprehension of the incalculable evils, moral and material, that must flow to Europe from such a war as was then impending,

and he was ready, as he says to one of his correspondents, 'to brave all ridicule in going, were it only on a forlorn hope, on the side of peace.' We may be very sure that it was not without 'strong crying and tears,' to Him 'who holdeth in His hand the king's heart as the rivers of water which He turneth whithersoever He will,' that this enterprise was begun and continued.

The following was the address which the deputation were commissioned to present to the Emperor:—

ADDRESS FROM THE RELIGIOUS SOCIETY OF FRIENDS
TO THE EMPEROR OF RUSSIA.

TO NICHOLAS, EMPEROR OF ALL THE RUSSIAS.

'May it please the Emperor,

'We, the undersigned, Members of a Meeting representing the religious Society of Friends (commonly called Quakers) in Great Britain, venture to approach the Imperial presence, under a deep conviction of religious duty, and in the constraining love of Christ our Saviour.

'We are, moreover, encouraged so to do by the many proofs of condescension and Christian kindness manifested by thy late illustrious brother, the Emperor Alexander, as well as by thy honoured mother, to some of our brethren in religious profession.

'It is well known that, apart from all political consideration, we have, as a Christian Church, uniformly upheld a testimony against war, on the simple ground that it is utterly condemned by the precepts of Christianity, as well as altogether incompatible with the Spirit of its Divine Founder, who is emphatically styled the "Prince of Peace." This conviction we have repeatedly pressed upon our own rulers, and often, in the language of bold but respectful remonstrance, have we urged upon them the maintenance of peace, as the true policy, as well as manifest duty, of a Christian Government.

'And now, O great Prince, permit us to express the sorrow which fills our hearts, as Christians and as men, in contemplating the probability of war in any portion of the continent of Europe. Deeply to be deplored would it

be were that peace which to a very large extent has happily prevailed so many years exchanged for the unspeakable horrors of war, with all its attendant moral evil and physical suffering.

‘It is not our business, nor do we presume to offer any opinion upon the question now at issue between the Imperial Government of Russia and that of any other country; but estimating the exalted position in which Divine Providence has placed thee, and the solemn responsibilities devolving upon thee, not only as an earthly potentate, but also as a believer in that Gospel which proclaims “peace on earth” and “good-will toward men,” we implore Him by whom “kings reign and princes decree justice” so to influence thy heart and to direct thy councils at this momentous crisis, that thou mayst practically exhibit to the nations, and even to those who do not profess the “like precious faith,” the efficacy of the Gospel of Christ, and the universal application of His command, “Love your enemies; bless them that curse you; do good to them that hate you; and pray for them which despitefully use you and persecute you; that ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven.”’

‘The more fully the Christian is persuaded of the justice of his own cause, the greater his magnanimity in the exercise of forbearance. May the Lord make thee the honoured instrument of exemplifying this true nobility; thereby securing to thyself and to thy vast dominions that true glory and those rich blessings which could never result from the most successful appeal to arms.

‘Thus, O mighty Prince, may the miseries and devastation of war be averted; and in that solemn day when “every one of us shall give account of himself to God,” may the benediction of the Redeemer apply to thee, “Blessed are the peace-makers, for they shall be called the children of God,” and mayest thou be permitted through a Saviour’s love to exchange an earthly for an heavenly crown—“a crown of glory which fadeth not away.”’

We are happy to be able to present to our readers

within the last year or two, when, for the first time, she gave me reason to complain. I will not now advert to the parties who were her principal instigators on that occasion; suffice it to say that it became my duty to interfere, and to claim from Turkey the fulfilment of her engagements. My representations were pressing but friendly, and I have every reason to believe that matters would soon have been settled if Turkey had not been induced by other parties to believe that I had ulterior objects in view; that I was aiming at conquest, aggrandisement, and the ruin of Turkey. I have solemnly disclaimed, and do now as solemnly disclaim, every such motive. I do not desire war; I abhor it as sincerely as you do, and am ready to forget the past, if only the opportunity be afforded me.

‘I have great esteem for your country, and a sincere affection for your Queen, whom I admire not only as a Sovereign, but as a lady, a wife, and a mother. I have placed full confidence in her, and have acted towards her in a frank and friendly spirit. I felt it my duty to call her attention to future dangers, which I considered as likely, sooner or latter, to arise in the East, in consequence of the existing state of things. What on my part was prudent foresight has been unfairly construed in your country into a designing policy, and an ambitious desire of conquest. This has deeply wounded my feelings and afflicted my heart. Personal insults and invectives I regard with indifference. It is beneath my dignity to notice them. And I am ready to forgive all that is personal to me, and to hold out my hand to my enemies in the true Christian spirit. I cannot understand what cause of complaint your nation has against Russia. I am anxious to avoid war by all possible means—I will not attack, and shall only act in self-defence; but I cannot be indifferent to what concerns the honour of my country. I have a duty to perform as a Sovereign. As a Christian I am ready to comply with the precepts of religion. On the present occasion, my great duty is to attend to the interests and honour of my country.’

Those who prefer to do so are, of course, at liberty to look upon all this as a farce, to regard the Emperor's professions as deliberate falsehoods, his courtesy to the deputation as mere policy, and his emotion and tears as simulated to impose upon these simple Quakers. They, at least, had a firm conviction of his sincerity. Nay, more, they had a strong belief that it was his intention to make some further communication, if not to make them the bearers of some proposals to our own Government in the interests of peace. Their reason for that belief was this. The interview took place on Thursday the 10th. Having fulfilled the duty for which they had come, the deputation were anxious to return with as little delay as possible, and had determined to start early on the following Monday. On Saturday Baron Nicolay had called upon them twice, and on the second occasion, as Mr. Sturge says in one of his letters, 'brought the final copy of the statement which the Emperor had made, and which there is no doubt had undergone his revision.' On Sunday, after having worship in their own room, Mr. Sturge and Mr. Pease had gone to take their leave of their excellent friend Mr. Gillibrand, whose kindness had been unceasing to them from the beginning. On their return they found that Baron Nicolay had been at their lodgings again, with a message from the Emperor begging them to delay their departure for a day. We extract the account of this matter from one of Mr. Sturge's letters:—

'In the morning (that is, of Sunday) we held our little meeting together, and after receiving sundry calls, including one from Baron Stigietz, the court banker, H. Pease and I went to make what we thought would be a parting call on our excellent friends the Gillibrands, but on our return we

the following account of the interview with the Emperor, which is much fuller than any yet published, from the pen of Mr. Robert Charleton :—

‘At the appointed hour we repaired to the palace, and were received by the Emperor at a private interview, no one else being present excepting Baron Nicolay, who acted as interpreter, the Emperor speaking in French. After the address had been read by Joseph Sturge, and presented to the Emperor, the latter asked us to be seated on a sofa, while he took a chair, and entered into free conversation, kindly giving us a full opportunity for making any verbal statement that we might wish to offer. Joseph Sturge then proceeded to give expression to what had rested on his mind, not entering into the political matters involved in the dispute, but confining himself to the moral and religious aspects of the question. In the course of his observations he contrasted the Mohammedan religion (professed by the Turks), which avowedly justifies the employment of the sword, with the religion of Him whose reign was to be emphatically one of *peace*. He also remarked that among the multitude who would be the victims, in the event of a European war, the greatest sufferers would probably be, not those who had caused the war, but innocent men, with their wives and children. On our thanking the Emperor for the kind reception he had given us, J. Sturge said, with much feeling, that although we should probably never see him again on this side of eternity, we wished him to know that there were those in England who desired his temporal and spiritual welfare as sincerely as his own subjects—when the Emperor shook hands with each of us very cordially, and, with eyes moistened with emotion, turned hastily away (apparently to conceal his feelings), saying, “My wife also wishes to see you.” We were accordingly ushered into the Empress’s apartment, where we spent a short time in conversation with her and her daughter, the Grand Duchess Olga, both of whom spoke English pretty well. The Empress said to us, “I have just seen the Emperor; the tears were in his eyes.”

'I may here notice the deep impression evidently made by J. Sturge personally, both on Count Nesselrode and afterwards on the Emperor. His frank and open manner, his obvious sincerity and transparency of character, and the great simplicity and *depth of feeling* with which he advocated the cause of peace, must have contrasted strongly with that guarded reserve and that studied obsequiousness of manner which usually mark such intercourse with despotic power. The simple and often hesitating manner in which he expressed himself rather added to the weight of what he said, showing, as it did, that his reliance was on the power of the truths which he advocated, and not at all on his own manner of enforcing them.'

The following is the substance of what the Emperor said in reply to the address. It was taken down immediately afterwards, and submitted to the revision of Baron Nicolay, who testified to its accuracy.

'I wish to offer some explanation of the circumstances which led to the present unhappy dispute. We received the blessings of Christianity from the Greek Empire, and this has established, and maintained ever since, a link of connection, both moral and religious, between Russia and that Power. The ties that have thus united the two countries have subsisted for 900 years, and were not severed by the conquest of Russia by the Tartars; and when, at a later period, our country succeeded in shaking off that yoke, and the Greek Empire, in its turn, fell under the sway of the Turks, we still continued to take a lively interest in the welfare of our coreligionists there: and when Russia became powerful enough to resist the Turks, and to dictate the terms of peace, we paid particular attention to the well-being of the Greek Church, and procured the insertion, in successive treaties, of most important articles in her favour. I have myself acted as my predecessors had done, and the Treaty of Adrianople, in 1829, was as explicit as the former ones in this respect. Turkey, on her part, recognised this right of religious interference, and fulfilled her engagements until

found Baron Nicolay again with Robert Charleton. The Baron told us that the Emperor had concluded to send a reply, addressed especially to the Friends who had deputed us to bring the address, which would be signed on his behalf by the Chancellor of the Empire, and as this would be the official document, the other would be for private use only. That the Duchess of Leuchtenberg, the widowed daughter of the Emperor, who has been lately in England, and who with her young children lives in a palace by herself, wished to see us at half-past twelve o'clock on third day (Tuesday) and that to make up for this loss of our time, Count Nesselrode would send a courier before us to facilitate our change of horses, &c. That at this interview, he intimated, we should probably see other members of the royal family, including the Heir Apparent and the Grand Duke Constantine. We of course agreed to this arrangement, and shall hardly get off before six o'clock to-morrow night.'

The interview with the Duchess of Leuchtenberg took place. But by that time the whole aspect of things had undergone a change.

'We called,' says Mr. Charleton, 'at the palace of the Grand Duchess as proposed. But here our reception was very different from what it had been a few days before at the Imperial Palace. Instead of the earnest and cordial manner of the Emperor and Empress, the Grand Duchess received us with merely formal politeness. Her sorrowful air, and the depressed look of the gentleman in waiting, made it evident to us that a great change had come over the whole aspect of affairs. Nor were we at a loss to account for this change. *The mail from England had arrived*, with newspapers giving an account of the opening of parliament and of the intensely warlike speeches in the House of Commons.'

Very singular was the effect produced in this country by the intelligence of the Friends' mission to Russia. The 'Times' was at first surprised into something like generous admiration of the act.

‘It would certainly,’ it said, ‘be unfitting in us, and nothing could be further from us, than to cast anything like ridicule upon the conscientious efforts of patriotic men, who are honestly endeavouring to work out their theory in practice, although we may be profoundly convinced that their opinions are but little in unison with the age in which they live, and the stern realities of the actual position of affairs. . . . Still we must not deny to the gentlemen engaged in this piece of enthusiastic folly the praise of sincerity. It appears that, in the midst of the most inclement season of the year, they have quitted their own homes, and undertaken a difficult, not to say hazardous journey, with the sole object of testing the value of their theories.’

In a few days, however, it repented its generosity, and published one of the bitterest and coarsest articles that ever appeared, even in its pages. This was taken as the key-note for popular opinion, and the deputation were followed to Russia with a storm of mingled indignation and scorn which could hardly have been surpassed if, instead of being messengers of peace on earth and good-will among men, they had been apostles of treason and blasphemy. When the papers therefore reached St. Petersburg, they could not fail to produce, as they were intended to produce, unfavourable effects as respects the objects of the journey. All this, however, might have been overlooked. But when it was found that leading ministers of the Crown had allowed themselves to indulge in violent diatribes against the Emperor and his Government, with whom they were still professedly at peace, the feeling of resentment was naturally intense, and all hope of accommodation was from that moment surrendered.

But the respect shown to the deputation personally remained unabated. ‘Very great kindness,’ says Mr. Charleton, ‘has been shown to us by the English

residents in St. Petersburg, and indeed by all classes. On the day before our departure we had a very friendly call from an old Russian Admiral, who is much respected; and on the afternoon of our leaving, we had also a long call from Baron Nicolay, an attaché of Count Nesselrode, from whom we have experienced much persevering kindness.'

The Emperor also sent a Government courier to accompany them on their return, with orders that everything should be done to contribute to the rapidity and comfort of their journey.*

No doubt, so far as any influence in preventing the war was concerned, the mission of the three Friends to Petersburg was unsuccessful. But that it was in vain we do not believe. It proved to the world what indeed at that moment sorely needed proof, that all Christian feeling was not extinct in England. It presented a fine example of moral heroism, for it required

* That the Emperor was at the moment deeply touched by the simple and earnest words of Joseph Sturge, delivered as they were in a voice tremulous with deep emotion, does not admit of a doubt. But Mr. Kinglake insinuates in his last volumes, and promises to prove in his next, that this feeling became afterwards changed into a frenzy of anger against the Friends for having deceived him. We must, however, say cordially that we shall look for some better *proof* of this allegation than what is afforded by imaginary conversations which, however dramatically effective, have about as much historic value as those of Lucian or Landor. Nor shall we be satisfied with vague oracular references to rumours that have somehow floated in solemn secrecy to the ear of the author alone. This mystery of allusion may be a merit in a poet, as mystery we are told is one element of the sublime, but hardly so in a historian, whose business it is to establish truth, not to excite the imagination. It is, at least, very certain that after the death of the Emperor, the Empress Dowager, who worshipped the memory of her husband, on more than one occasion, in interviews with members of the Society of Friends, referred to the mission of Mr. Sturge and his companions in a very different tone from what we should have expected had she been aware that the remembrance of it had driven the Emperor to the transport of wrath described by Mr. Kinglake.

a far higher order of courage to do what they did, in the state of public opinion which then prevailed in this country, than that which suffices to push men into the imminent deadly breach. Dr. Macgowan, the distinguished medical missionary to China, states, that while travelling in the interior of that country, he found that the story of the journey to Petersburg had somehow floated into that remote region, and had strangely impressed the not very susceptible people of China as a practical illustration of the real life and power of Christianity.

But there are persons who gravely maintain that the Quaker mission not only failed to prevent, but was actually the cause of the Russian war. This charge is so supremely absurd that it might scarcely seem to merit refutation. Yet it has been remarked by no ordinary observer of human life,

‘A foolish thing that’s said but oft enough
Shall pass at last for absolutely wise,
And not with fools exclusively.’*

It is strange, surely, that anyone, however strongly prejudiced, should find the cause of the war, not in the rival intrigues and angry altercations of diplomatists ; not in the frantic outcry against France and its ruler which had resounded through England for two preceding years, and which must have persuaded the Emperor of Russia, if indeed he nourished the ambitious projects ascribed to him, that it was next to impossible the two nations could then combine against him ; not in the loud voice of insult and challenge hurled from a thousand throats against the great northern potentate himself, stinging into fierce resentment and obstinacy the proudest and most powerful man in Christendom ; not

* Mrs. Browning.

in the moving of fleets and the mustering of armies, which brought men inflamed by passion into perilous proximity to each other—not to any or all of these things combined, but to the presentation of a religious address by three Christian gentlemen to the Emperor of Russia, reminding him that ‘war is utterly condemned by the precepts of Christianity and is altogether incompatible with the spirit of its Divine Founder, who is emphatically styled the Prince of Peace.’ The people who say this of course pay no heed to events or dates. They forget that *before* the mission to Petersburg the Russian army had crossed the Pruth; that the allied squadrons of England and France were already anchored in the Bosphorus; that the Turkish Divan had declared war against Russia and commenced hostilities on the Danube; that the Government of the Porte had peremptorily told our ambassador at Constantinople that they were determined to reject every kind of note proposing a peaceful adjustment of the difficulty, however carefully expressed; that the Turks had seized the Russian fort of St. Nicholas on the eastern coast of the Euxine, and that Russia, in retaliation, had destroyed the Turkish fleet at Sinope.

It is impossible not to feel that there is a most significant confession of inward misgiving in the elaborate attempts that are made to father the responsibility of the Russian war upon anybody and everybody but those who were its avowed and active promoters. If, as we were loudly and universally told at the time, and as we are sometimes told still, though with a far more bated breath—if the war was a just, necessary, and glorious war, a war for the defence of the right against insolent and tyrannous wrong, a war of freedom against despotism, of civilisation against barbarism; if, above all, it was a

war that was inevitable to prevent all Western Europe from being swamped by another irruption of the Goths, a war that must have come sooner or later, and could not have come at a better time—why should those who were its ardent advocates be so eager to shift the burden of their glory upon other men's shoulders? Might we not rather have expected a jealous rivalry of claims to the honour of having helped to pass so blessed a consummation? Instead of which those who were the most conspicuous favourers and eulogists of the war now vehemently exclaim, 'We had nothing to do with it. It was the Emperor of the French that did it. It was Lord Aberdeen that did it. It was the peace party in England that did it. It was the Quaker deputation to St. Petersburg that did it.' Is there not in all this an implicit acknowledgment that the war was a bad and indefensible business of which everybody is beginning to feel ashamed? And therefore, according to a fashion not uncommon in this world, those who did their utmost to produce it, now lay the guilt of it at the door of those who did their utmost to prevent it.*

* 'There do in every age occur disorders and mishaps, springing from various complications of causes, working some of them in a more open and discernible, others in a more secret and subtle way (especially from Divine judgment and Providence checking or chastising sin): from such occurrences it is common to snatch occasion and matter for calumny. Those who are disposed this way are ready peremptorily to charge them upon whomsoever they dislike or dissent from, although without any apparent cause, or upon most frivolous and senseless pretences; yea, often when reason showeth the quite contrary, and they who are so charged are in just esteem of all men the least obnoxious to such accusations. So usually the best friends of mankind, those who most heartily wish the peace and prosperity of the world, and most earnestly to their power strive to promote them, have all the disturbances and disasters happening charged on them by those fiery vixens who, in pursuance of their base designs, or gratification of their wild passions, really do themselves embroil things, and raise miserable combustions in the world. So it is,

It appears to us that there can be no mystery whatever as to the immediate cause of the war. There were no doubt many causes, near and remote, concurring to produce that Eastern difficulty which was the pretext for the war. But there were two reasons and two only which rendered a pacific solution of the difficulty impossible. First, we had a Minister at Constantinople who set himself resolutely to thwart every attempt to compose the difference between Russia and the Porte until the slumbering fanaticism of the Turks had been so roused as to render all composition hopeless. Secondly, we had a public opinion at home so inflamed by the press into fury against Russia that it swept the Government as with the force of a hurricane into the war, we believe, against its own judgment and will.

that they who have the conscience to do mischief, will have the confidence also to disavow the blame and the iniquity, and to lay the burden of it on those who are most innocent.'—Barrow's *Sermon on Slander*.

CHAPTER XXIV.

EFFORTS DURING THE WAR AND AT ITS CONCLUSION.

Mr. Sturge's Sorrow at the War and its Effects—Letters to Mr. Tappan and Mr. Rhoades—Endeavours to allay the War Spirit—The Obloquy to which he was exposed—Accusations by some of his Fellow-citizens—His Replies—Letter to the Working Classes—Letters from Mr. Jay—Altered Feeling now as to the War—Conclusion of the War—Anxiety of the Peace Party to get Arbitration recognised in the new Treaties—Deputation to Lord Clarendon—His Lordship's Reply—Mr. Sturge determines to go to Paris—Communications with the Plenipotentiaries—Interview with Lord Clarendon—His Promise—How well redeemed—The Arbitration Protocol—Mr. Sturge's Letter to Lord Clarendon.

Soon after Mr. Sturge's return from St. Petersburg the war broke out. Indeed the temper of the nation rendered that issue of the quarrel inevitable. It only remained for him, therefore, to use his best efforts, in conjunction with other friends of peace, to allay the war feeling. Discouraging as those efforts appeared at the time, it was impossible that he could do otherwise without denying his own nature. While the 'horrible and heart-rending scenes' going on in the Crimea, which soon began to bring home to the people the real nature of the work in which they had so lightly embarked, touched almost to anguish the heart of one so quick to sympathise with all forms of human suffering, he was, if possible, still more deeply pained in watching the disastrous moral effects which the war was producing at home in unchristianising the temper of multitudes, and diverting public attention from better objects.

His letters abound with allusions showing how much his heart was affected by this state of things. Writing to Mr. Tappan, November 18, 1854, he says :—

‘I am going down hill both bodily and mentally ; yet it is cause for thankfulness that we have been permitted so long the privilege of health and strength, and a disposition to labour, however feebly, for the amelioration of human suffering, and the promotion of human happiness. But I have often to lament my coldness in love to Him from whom all these blessings flow, and without whose redeeming mercy I can have no hope of being anchored in the haven of eternal rest. Our London Anti-Slavery Committee have decided upon a Conference of its Friends in this country with any foreign ones that can attend, to consider what can be done for the promotion of the cause. . . . But this sad war absorbs almost all that is good, and promotes all that is evil.’

Again, in December of the same year, to the same friend, referring apparently to a proposal that had been made to him by Mr. Tappan to join in the purchase of an estate in Jamaica, for an experiment in free labour, he says :—

‘I wrote thee very hastily in reply to thy proposition of purchasing an estate in Jamaica, in which I said that I should prefer placing 500 dollars at thy disposal towards the loss, leaving it to thy judgment to do with it as thou thought fit. Further reflection, and perhaps increased pressure on my time in consequence of this horrible all-absorbing war, has confirmed me in this view of the question. The fact is, that what little talents God has entrusted me with should, in the first place, be devoted to endeavouring to bring to an end this great national crime and calamity. It was under this feeling that, though I assented to the holding the Anti-Slavery Conference last month, and promised to assist in it, yet I could not enter into it with much interest. We have little right to admonish other nations on slavery, or anything else, while we are sending our people to commit wholesale murder on the terri-

tories of another sovereign, without, in my opinion, any just cause, even if such means were justifiable at any time. I have a little hope that the war feeling is not quite so rampant as it was. The fact that the meeting against John Bright, held at Manchester, failed in its intended object, and that only about 43 out of 6,000 of his former supporters signed the requisition for calling the meeting, is, I think, an indication of it.'

Again, writing to Mr. Samuel Rhoades, of Philadelphia, in February 1855, he excuses his remissness as a correspondent by saying:—

'The fact is that I have been discouraged by this horrid war, and feel that if I can be of any service in any way, my first duty is to cooperate with those who are endeavouring to allay the mad war-spirit so rife in my own country, that I have thought it right to abstain from taking much part in anything else. . . . Thou wilt see by the newspapers that we are in a curious position as respects our Government. We had the greatest hope of Lord Aberdeen in regard to peace, and had he remained in office a few weeks longer, there was a fair prospect of its being attained, but now I fear we shall have a terrible slaughter again ere long at Sebastopol. John Bright and Richard Cobden are acting a noble part in resisting the war mania, and the fearful carnage it occasions, as well as the increasing sufferings amongst our poor, are bringing many over to their opinion who were a short time ago in favour of the war.'

Mr. Sturge was not a man to shrink from the avowal of his sentiments at such a time, whatever the obloquy it might bring upon him. And he had to endure his share of it, like all who dared to speak in deprecation of the war. For the first time at Birmingham he was refused a hearing, and even grossly insulted at a public meeting. A placard put up in the town, entitled 'War and dear Bread,' stating that the high price of corn

then prevailing was owing to the war, and quoting a passage from Miss Martineau's History to show how similar results had followed from the French war, had been ascribed to Mr. Sturge. It was thought worth while to bring the lady herself on the stage, and a letter from Miss Martineau was published in the Birmingham journals peremptorily denying that the war had anything to do with the high price of corn, though it might have been thought that the opinion of one of the leading corn-dealers in England was, on *that* question at least, as good an authority as that of the celebrated authoress. Anonymous letters were addressed to him, charging *him* with being the cause of the high price of bread. 'I warn you,' said one of these writers, 'for I hear it throughout the town, that if it is not lowered very soon something of a very serious nature will occur to disturb the peace of the town, and you will then be considered in a worse light than even Nicholas himself. You have it in your power to avert the dreadful event without any injury to yourself or the conspirators you act with. I advise you to take time by the forelock.' Mr. Sturge quietly replied in a letter to the papers:— 'If the writer of this letter will give me his name I shall be glad to meet him and his friends, and if they can point out how *I* can lower the price of bread to the public, I shall rejoice to join them in any legitimate means to carry their plan into effect.'* Another corre-

* Even this charge, fantastic as it was, was not without its precedent, as Mr. Cobden reminded Mr. Sturge.

'It is amusing,' he says, 'to see the mad vagaries of the persons who charge *you* of all men with being the cause of dear bread! It reminds me of what occurred after the Great French war had produced its natural consequences—dear bread and want of employment—when the London mob in the neighbourhood of Spitalfields directed their vengeance against the Quakers as being the authors of their misery—the Quakers having been, be it remembered, almost the only people who steadily opposed the

spondent of one of the Birmingham journals charged him with having 'admitted before a committee of the House of Lords, a few years ago, that he had combined with other rich speculators to buy up English grain in various markets to raise the price thereof.' Again Mr. Sturge contented himself with quoting the passage in question from his evidence before a committee, not of the House of Lords (where he was never examined), but of the House of Commons, showing that the charge was not only not true, but in every respect the exact converse of the truth. Indeed, the language in which he was spoken of at that time by some of his fellow-citizens of Birmingham—specimens of which are now before us—was such as fills one now with surprise and sorrow, and would probably give sincere pain to those who used it, if it were now quoted. We forbear, therefore, further allusion to the circumstances of that unhappy period. Nor should we have alluded to them at all except as illustrative of one of the many evils attendant upon a state of war, that of throwing a whole community into what it is really difficult to describe otherwise than as a temporary insanity, which clouds its judgment, envenoms its heart, and transforms the naturally generous impulses of the people into such a paroxysm of mingled ferocity and fear, as prompts them to turn round and rend those whom they have been accustomed most to revere. Mr. Sturge ventured to remind his countrymen at the time of certain historical facts showing this tendency, in a letter which was published in one of the Birmingham journals, and also in the 'Times.' We think a few extracts from that letter will not be without interest:—

war for which the said mob were clamorous. You will see this referred to incidentally in the 1st vol. of the *Life of William Allen*, p. 60.'

‘TO MY FELLOW-TOWNSMEN OF THE WORKING CLASSES.

‘In the “Birmingham Journal” of last week, some of you may have read a letter from Harriet Martineau, together with editorial comments on a placard entitled “War and dear Bread,” lately exhibited in Birmingham. I know not who was the author of the placard in question—which was printed at Manchester—but I do know the individual who caused it to be put up in Birmingham, and I think that in so doing he exercised not only an undoubted right, but a sound judgment.

‘I entirely differ from the celebrated authoress of the letter referred to, which has since appeared in other papers, as to the present high price of bread not arising from the war. No one conversant with the foreign corn trade of this country would venture to assert that, could we be supplied from the shores of the Black Sea and the Sea of Azoff, the present rate of prices could be maintained. From five ports in these seas alone, upwards of thirty millions of bushels of wheat were shipped in 1853 to the United Kingdom and other parts of Europe. Wheat which is now worth 10s. per bushel in England can, at the present time, be bought in some of these ports at less than 2s. per bushel. The crop of 1854 in this part of the world was such as to justify the belief that, had peace continued, still more would have been supplied in 1854 and 1855. Not only is all this stopped by the war, but also exports from the Danube and several other quarters.

‘Though I may not live to see it, I have no doubt the time will come when the people of England will be better able to judge who are “doing the work of the enemy”—the advocates of peace, or the author of such articles as the one thus headed in the “Journal.”

‘We know from our past history it has unhappily been the invariable course of things in this country, that every war is at the outset almost unboundedly popular, while the few who have resisted the prevailing frenzy have as invariably been persecuted and stigmatised as doing the “enemy’s work.” Sir

Robert Walpole's opposition to the war in 1739, though now everybody admits it to have been, as T. B. Macaulay says, "altogether unjustifiable," "drew upon him," says his biographer, "odium and unpopularity from all quarters." In regard to our war with America, to prevent her obtaining her independence, Burke says that he was branded as "an American" for opposing it; "and all men," he adds, "who wished for peace, or retained any sentiment of inoderation, were overcome or silenced." The city of Bristol, which he then represented, was so excited against him, that he declares "he would have sooner fled to the extremities of the earth than have shown himself there."

'In reference to the last war with France, so furious was the feeling of the country that Charles James Fox and the few men in and out of parliament who joined him in resisting the war could scarcely walk the streets without being hooted and mobbed as "jacobins," "traitors," "friends of the enemy," &c. I am told that among Gillray's caricatures, which held the place then that "Punch" does now, there is one representing Fox as a telegraph (such as telegraphs were then), standing on the Cliffs of Dover, signalling the French to come over; and Horner says in one of his letters, "I could name to you gentlemen with good coats on, and good sense in their own affairs, who believe that Fox is actually in the pay of France." But even Lord John Russell has said that "*that* war was unnecessary." Nor can we forget that the very same writers who have urged the Government into the present war are those who, two or three years ago, employed their utmost efforts to create a misunderstanding between this country and France, by heaping every kind of contumely upon the head of its ruler, whom they represented as a brigand waiting his opportunity to make a piratical descent upon the coast of England. Had they succeeded, it would have inevitably plunged us into war with that country; having failed in that object, and succeeding in forcing the Government into a war with Russia, though she has done us no wrong, they now eulogise the very man whom they formerly painted in such dark colours as utterly base, treacherous, and untrustworthy.

‘The carnage which has already taken place in the Crimea, the voice of mourning which has been heard in many families in Great Britain, and the increased sufferings of the poor, may be but the commencement of the chastisements of Providence for our national crimes. May these considerations lead us, as a nation, to act more in accordance with that spirit which recognises all mankind as our brethren, and with the example of Him who “came not to destroy men’s lives, but to save them.”

‘I remain, very sincerely, your friend,

‘JOSEPH STURGE.

‘Birmingham : 12th month 2, 1854.’

But while thus assailed at home, he received words of kindly greeting and encouragement from some of his correspondents abroad. His friend Judge Jay especially had followed the course of the war with intense interest. He was an eminently able man, full of love and admiration for England, and perhaps it may not be amiss to quote a few sentences from his letters, that we may have an opportunity for a moment of seeing ourselves as others saw us during that crisis in our history. Under date of February 25, 1855, he says :—

‘I have paid great attention to the progress of the present war. I know you will not condemn my frankness when I say that the sin of your Government in commencing it, is equalled only by their folly in conducting it. That I might the more easily follow the operations of your fleet in the Baltic, I early purchased a chart of that sea. I was astonished on inspecting it to observe how very shallow was the water in the vicinity of the Russian fortresses, and I was puzzled to understand how your ships were to assail Cronstadt and approach St. Petersburg; but I took for granted the Admiralty knew what they were about. But it seems Sir Charles, *after* his arrival, made the discovery that the water was too shoal for his ships! If there were no charts of the

Baltic to be procured in London, we could have furnished him with them, in which the soundings of the bays and harbours are laid down. So also it seems that Lord Raglan was unacquainted with the strength of Sebastopol, and expected to take it "right away," intending, perhaps, to make it his winter quarters, after capturing Odessa, &c. &c. An English baronet last spring assured me the war would be over by autumn, as Russia by that time would be brought to terms. Lord Aberdeen was, I believe, averse to the war. Had he had firmness enough to have resigned office rather than commence the work of human slaughter, he would have held a far higher place in your future history than he will now occupy.

'You Quakers, and those who act with you, are the real heroes of this war. Moral courage is of far higher quality than that which is animal. . . .

'If convenient, I wish you would send me the tracts which have been issued by the Peace Society against the present war. God bless old England—for with all her faults I greatly love and admire her—and may she have a speedy deliverance from the disastrous conflict into which she has foolishly plunged.'

A few months later, and the same correspondent writes again:—

'All my sympathies in this contest are with Great Britain, and the more I admire your country the more do I deplore the false position in which she has placed herself. I have been disappointed in the moral independence of your statesmen. I fear Lord Aberdeen did violence to his conscience in supporting the war. Mr. Gladstone has uttered some excellent sentiments, but he too wants what we American abolitionists call "back-bone"—a fearless disregard of public opinion and personal popularity. The only prominent men in your parliament whom I really admire are those who are stigmatised as belonging to the Manchester school. Let them bide their time. Their death-bed will not be rendered uneasy by the recollection of their efforts in the cause of

peace, and the future will bear testimony to their *wisdom* and their *virtue*.'

In Mr. Sturge's own letter, which we have cited a page or two back, he expresses his belief that though he might not live to see it, the time would come when the judgment of England as to the necessity and wisdom of the war would undergo a change. Brief as was the time he survived this observation, he *did* see that change already beginning to declare itself, and had he been spared a year or two longer, he would have found the journal which assailed him and his companions so fiercely for trying to prevent the war, thus summing up what is probably become now the final conviction of most intelligent Englishmen; 'We must frankly own,' were the words of the 'Times' in 1861, 'that we feel somewhat more free to act like men and Christians now, than we could do five years ago. That ill-starred war, those half million of British, French, and Russian men left in the Crimea, those two hundred millions of money wasted in the worst of all ways, have discharged to the last iota all the debt of Christian Europe to Turkey. Never was so great an effort made for so worthless an object. . . . *It is with no small reluctance we admit a gigantic effort, and an infinite sacrifice, to have been made in vain.*'

When the war was brought to an end in 1856, and the representatives of the great Powers were met to settle the terms of peace, the friends of peace in this country felt it was a matter of great importance that the principle of stipulated arbitration, for which they had been so long contending, should, if possible, be recognised in the New Treaty, and so become a part, as it were, of the international law of Europe. A large and influential deputation, including some eighteen

or twenty members of parliament, waited upon Lord Palmerston with a Memorial from the Peace Congress Committee, earnestly urging upon Her Majesty's Government 'the importance of proposing at the conferences then sitting, some system of international arbitration which may bring the great interests of nations within the cognisance of certain fixed rules of justice and right.' Lord Palmerston received the deputation with all his wonted urbanity. But while acknowledging that 'associations like those there represented, though he could not go with them to the full extent, must yet have great influence on the general opinion of mankind, and greatly dispose men to prefer the solid advantages of peace to the more dazzling results of war;' his lordship raised all sorts of objections to the proposal, and left little ground to hope that his influence would be exerted in its favour.

The writer may perhaps be here permitted to indulge in an allusion of a somewhat personal nature, for the sake of illustrating some of those qualities of character in Mr. Sturge, which rendered his adhesion of such inestimable value to any cause with which he was associated. The biographer had a strong conviction that the friends of peace ought not to desist from their endeavours notwithstanding the discouraging answer of the prime minister. He insisted, with more perhaps of pertinacity than prudence, that they should proceed to Paris, and try to bring the matter before the attention of the plenipotentiaries, and through them of the various sovereigns they represented. But he found little response to this proposal. Many of those with whom it had been his pleasure and honour so long to work in this great question were at the moment somewhat disheartened by the

course of events and by Lord Palmerston's reply, and thought no good end would be answered by such a proceeding as he suggested, if it did not, indeed, do positive harm by exposing the cause and its abettors to ridicule. Several gentlemen who were invited to join in such a mission declined the invitation. Unable, however, to rid himself of the impression that they would fail at a most critical moment in the duty which devolved upon them as those who had assumed the advocacy of a great principle, if they shrank from making another attempt to bring it before the august assembly then sitting in Paris, he opened his heart to Joseph Sturge. His reply was frank, instant, cordial. 'Thou art right,' was his language. 'If no one else will go with thee, I will; and I am prepared to go not only to Paris, but if necessary to Berlin, Vienna, Turin, and even to St. Petersburg should there be time, and see if we can't get access to the various sovereigns whose plenipotentiaries are sitting at Paris.' We determined therefore to go. Afterwards Mr. Charles Hindley, member of parliament for Ashton, kindly agreed to accompany us. A memorial was drawn up in which the subject was presented in the best light and with the best skill and earnestness we could command. And having prepared copies of this document addressed to each of the imperial and royal personages represented in the Congress, we proceeded to the French metropolis. Our first step was to place the memorial in the hands of the plenipotentiaries, with an earnest request that it might be transmitted to their respective sovereigns, at the same time furnishing each of them with a copy. We have reason to believe that this was done in the majority of instances, if not in all. Communications to this effect were received from Count Walewski, Count Cavour, and the Prussian ministers,

who indeed told us at a personal interview that when, according to our wishes, they forwarded the memorial to the king their master, His Majesty had immediately replied instructing them earnestly to sustain our proposal if it were brought before the Congress. But the question with the deputation was, how can it be brought before the Congress? Their only hope was in Lord Clarendon, who had received them, when they waited upon him with so much of genial sympathy for their object and frank cordiality of manner as cheered them not a little, and still dwells gratefully in the memory of the only survivor of the deputation. He also started some difficulties, especially as regards the binding nature of the engagement to submit future differences to arbitration which the memorial recommended. 'Still, gentlemen,' said his lordship, 'I will do what I can to bring the matter before the Congress.'

With this promise the deputation were fain to be content, and after remaining at Paris for three weeks they departed with no very sanguine hopes of success, sustained only by the consciousness that they had endeavoured to the best of their ability to do what they had felt it their duty to attempt. But when several weeks later the protocols of the Congress were published, they found that Lord Clarendon had, indeed, most loyally redeemed his promise, and had introduced the question to his colleagues with a force and earnestness which proved that his heart was thoroughly in the matter. He was immediately sustained by the French and Prussian Plenipotentiaries, and ultimately a resolution was unanimously passed recognising the duty of having recourse to arbitration, not indeed in the binding form which the memorialists had ventured to recommend, but still in a form sufficiently distinct and emphatic to

give to the great principle the full sanction of that august assembly.

The text of the protocol is as follows:—

‘The plenipotentiaries do not hesitate to express, in the name of their Governments, the wish that States between which any serious misunderstandings may arise, should, before appealing to arms, have recourse, so far as circumstances might allow, to the good offices of a friendly power. The plenipotentiaries hope that the Governments not represented at the Congress will unite in the sentiment which has inspired the wish recorded in the present protocol.’

The extreme value of ‘this happy innovation,’ as it was called by Lord Clarendon, was recognised at the time, as it has been often since by some of our leading statesmen. In the discussion which took place at the opening of parliament respecting the conditions of peace, Mr. Gladstone said, ‘As to the proposal to submit international differences to arbitration, I think that is in itself a very great triumph, a powerful engine in behalf of civilisation and humanity. It is, perhaps, the first time that the representatives of the principal nations of Europe have given an emphatic utterance to sentiments which contain, at least, a qualified disapproval of a resort to war, and asserted the supremacy of reason, of justice, humanity, and religion.’ The Earl of Derby, on a subsequent occasion, referred to it as ‘the principle which, to its endless honour, was embodied in the protocols by the Conference of Paris.’ The Earl of Malmesbury has pronounced this act of the Conference as ‘one of the most important to civilisation and to the security of the peace of Europe,’ because ‘it recognised and established the immortal truth, that time, by giving place for reason to operate, is as much a preventive as a healer of hostilities.’

Mr. Sturge was deeply moved with a sense of gratitude to Lord Clarendon for the part he had acted in this matter, and wrote to his lordship as follows :—

‘TO LORD CLARENDON.

‘I know of how little value the approbation of an humble individual like myself must be to those in high station ; and in the present instance the expression of it may perhaps be impertinent. But I can hardly feel excused without expressing my sincere thanks to Lord Clarendon for so fully acting upon the promise he was kind enough to give, when, with my friend Charles Hindley and Henry Richard, I had the pleasure of seeing him at Paris—that he would do what he could to promote the recognition by the Conference of the principle of reference or arbitration for the settlement of future international disputes. Though what has been done may not be all some of us could wish, yet it is perhaps quite as much as we could reasonably expect. I believe it would be difficult to estimate too highly the great moral effect of the Protocol No. 23 being unanimously adopted by such a Conference as the one which lately sat in Paris. I am persuaded that with the advance of civilisation and Christianity in the world, there will be far more genuine glory connected with the name of him that proposed such a means of preserving peace, than with that of the greatest military conqueror. But my earnest desire is, that when Lord Clarendon shall arrive at that final tribunal towards which we are all hastening, when all human praise or censure will be alike indifferent, he may receive the reward of the peacemaker, and, through a Saviour’s love, be admitted into that kingdom where war and discord are unknown.

‘Very respectfully,

‘JOSEPH STURGE.’

Lord Clarendon wrote a most kind reply, which has been unhappily mislaid, expressing his pleasure at having received such a communication, and informing

Mr. Sturge that he hoped there would be a much wider application given to the principle affirmed in the Paris protocol, because the great Powers who were parties to that agreement were inviting all the other Governments of the civilised world to give in their adhesion to it. We believe they have done so without an exception.

CHAPTER XXV.

MISSION TO FINLAND.

Destruction of Private Property by the British during the War—Account of the Merchants of Uleaborg—The Poor plundered—The Admirals in the Baltic opposed to this System—Distress of the People—Mr. Sturge is touched with the Story of their Sufferings—Determines to visit Finland—Mr. Thomas Harvey accompanies him—Extracts from Mr. Sturge's Letters—Helsingfors—Tampersfors—Abo—Nyistad—Evidence of the Sufferers—Influence of these Acts of Spoliation on the Feelings of the Inhabitants—Committee of Relief formed at Abo—Subscription opened in England for relieving the Finns—How it was administered—Good Effect on the Minds of the Inhabitants—Acknowledgment from the Emperor of Russia—The Conquest of Finland—Mr. Whittier's Lines.

BUT there was another matter arising out of the Russian war that engaged Mr. Sturge's attention in 1856. It is well known that during the war the property of unarmed citizens, not merely at sea but on land, was to a large extent destroyed by the British fleet, especially in the Gulf of Bothnia and the Sea of Azoff. As a specimen, we may give the account which the committee of which we are presently to speak received 'through an English mercantile house' of what took place at Uleaborg. It was verified by the names of the principal merchants in the place, 'who declared on oath' that in that port 'there was not,' to quote their own rather imperfect English, 'and had not been for the Russian Government's account, anything contraband, no gun-boats or other vessels of war built or meant to be built, neither was there in the town the least property belonging to the Russian Government, no fortifi-

cation or necessities of war, no military or other means of defence of what name soever, and therefore all the property destroyed by the admiral was private.' The inhabitants, 'incited by the piteous fate of Brahestadt,' had sent out a flag of truce to the admiral as he drew near their town, who promised not to molest or injure private persons or their property.' Feeling, therefore, that they were perfectly safe, since there were no soldiers, fortresses, nor contraband of war of any kind near the place, the deputation returned joyfully, and assured their fellow-townsmen they had nothing to fear. But notwithstanding the admiral's promise, here follows the description of what took place:—

'About two o'clock in the morning of June 2, the English were let loose, and soon thirteen vessels, of which six large ones were on the stocks, were in flames, besides seven ship-building yards with all the materials; the houses, mast-ware-houses, smithies, &c., tar depôts, with about 15,000 barrels of tar; the entire place called Sundbacken, with from fifteen to twenty ship cargoes of timber, deal, and spars; sixty ware-houses with all the goods in them; several thousand fathoms of firewood, and all the costly harbour piles with the piers. This awful fire, which, like a sea driven by the storm, sent its swelling waves up to the clouds, was, in the light spring night, as horrible as it was frightening, as the entire destruction of the town in the dry weather seemed certain. But Providence willed it otherwise. The wind, which the whole day before and just before the kindling was in the north-west, and would have covered the town with fire, shifted now to the north-east and drove on a storm. Dark watery clouds hastened, driven by the storm, over the town, and the pouring rain, together with the snow and sleet, helped, if not to extinguish, at least to check the destroying fire which now and then flamed up from between pillars of smoke, and still smouldered, a fortnight after, amid the ruins. Meanwhile the incendiaries proceeded to set fire to all that stood

in their way, magazines with seed, glass, salt, furs, household articles, &c., which were plundered with especial eagerness.'

But this, though bad enough, was not the worst. Not only were merchant ships found in various commercial ports, and vast stores of timber and corn, &c., consigned to the flames, but the small possessions of the humblest classes were either destroyed, or seized and carried away without payment. The poor fisherman's boat and nets, the small farmer's sheep and cattle, and even the scanty furniture and clothing in the peasant's cottage did not escape the depredations of British sailors and soldiers. All this was as impolitic as it was cruel, for it could not in the least have affected the objects or duration of the war, and may, indeed, be said to have been politically useful to the Russian Government, by exasperating into hostility a portion of its subjects who were previously singularly well-disposed towards England. It is but fair to say, that this conduct was by no means universal on the part of Her Majesty's ships visiting those shores. The Commanders on certain parts of the coast behaved in a generous and honourable manner, doing no damage to private property and taking nothing without compensation. It was understood, moreover, that both Admiral Dundas and Admiral Napier strongly disapproved of the system of wanton conflagration and pillage adopted or permitted by some of their officers. But it is one of the manifold curses of war, that it puts a terrible power in the hands of the rash, the reckless, and the ruthless. There cannot be a doubt that the work of havock committed was sufficiently extensive to inflict great and general suffering on the unfortunate Finlanders on many parts of the coast. A correspondent of the

'Times,' writing from Nisby, the chief port of Gothland, under date of June 23, 1854, thus describes what he witnessed:—'The number of fugitive Finns increases here every day. Whoever walks round our harbour sees a vast number of ragged people lying about on the stones, whose nocturnal abode is the tents they have contrived out of tattered sails. One shriek of woe sounds through all Finland! It will take many years before those wretched outcasts regain the point which they had hitherto by great assiduity obtained. All their vessels of any size are in the hands of the English, and the smaller ones totally destroyed. All the stock of timber and pitch that they are wont to export to Denmark, and even Germany, in the spring, and which constitutes their chief source of livelihood, is reduced to ashes. Anything and everything that might possibly be useful to the Russians has been destroyed.' We forbear to mention the names of individual officers who distinguished themselves in this ignoble warfare.

The wail of the unfortunate sufferers reduced thus to extremity of distress by British hands, and by acts which were in violation of even the cruel 'laws of war,' floated across the seas, penetrated into the quiet retreat of Edgbaston, and struck on the ear of one whose heart was sensitively attuned to 'the still sad music of humanity.' Mr. Sturge could find no rest without making an effort for their relief; and in order to do this in the most effectual manner, he determined to go in person and explore the true state of the case on the spot. He was happy enough to secure the companionship and aid of his old friend and colleague in his West Indian tour Mr. Thomas Harvey, of Leeds. This gentleman, on his return, wrote a series of graphic letters descriptive of

the whole journey, which appeared in one of the morning papers. From these we should have been glad, had our space permitted, to have cited largely, as they relate to a route of travel seldom visited by the British tourist. For even the ubiquitous 'Murray,' at that time at least, only conducted the pilgrim just along the margin of the coast, then adding :—' It is hardly to be imagined that any motives sufficiently strong will tempt a traveller to visit the wilds of a country, the scenery of which cannot bear comparison with that either of Sweden or Norway.' But though love of the adventurous and the picturesque might not prove sufficing motives to tempt men to explore those untrodden regions, the strong power of Christian benevolence supplied an adequate impulse.

Messrs. Sturge and Harvey having reached Lubeck by railway, embarked at that place on the 9th of September 1856, in a steamer for Helsingfors, which they reached on the 15th. Having there provided themselves with a suitable conveyance, and an interpreter acquainted with the Swedish and Finnish languages, they proceeded to Tamersfors, and from there to Abo, and Nyistad, and Raumo, then back again to Abo, and thence through Borga, Louisa, Fredericksham, and Wyborg, to St. Petersburg. They stopped at various points in their journey to investigate the facts for themselves, and to consult with certain benevolent persons on the spot, as to the best means of administering relief to the sufferers. At Nyistad and Raumo especially, they saw a considerable number of the unfortunate people whose property had been plundered or destroyed, and took down their statements from their own lips. Some of the cases were very painful and affecting.

We may introduce here a few extracts from Mr. Sturge's letters written during this journey :—

‘We arrived at Helsingfors about eleven o’clock, and though we were detained on board by the custom house regulations, the captain kindly sent a boat off from shore for our letters and forwarded them by the captain of another steamer who was a friend of his, and who was going before we got on shore. These letters we understood would be in the post office at Lubeck on 5th day night or 6th day morning, so that you would I expect, from a combination of favourable circumstances, hear from us from Finland about a fortnight after we left home. This we little expected. Our only letter of introduction here was to a gentleman who is now from home. No one there could speak English when we called, but a gentleman was sent for who could, who had been travelling through Finland with the Governor-General this summer. Though we did not tell him the object of our mission, he gave up the afternoon to us, assisted us in getting what Russian money was wanted and getting a new passport, which we found was needful. We found that the only posting here is by one rough two-wheeled vehicle, and that we are about 150 miles from the point we want to reach. We therefore bought a comfortable carriage in which we can sleep at night for about 20*l.*, which this gentleman used in travelling with the Governor-General. There are not more than one or two persons in the whole of this place of about 16,000 inhabitants that can speak English well, but we have engaged a sailor, who understands tolerably English, and Swedish, and the Finland language, to go with us to Tamersfors, where we hope to be on 4th day evening if we get off from here at eleven to-morrow and travel all night. The gentleman’s name, who has so much assisted us, is Frederick Lerche, and without telling him exactly the object of our visit, we have ascertained enough to confirm my previous impressions and to strengthen my belief that our coming is well timed. This harbour is one of the finest I have ever seen. The fortress of Sweaborg, which was destroyed by the English and French fleets, has been but partially rebuilt, but the destruction of other buildings is not so great as I expected to see, and no houses were destroyed here. A large Russian man-of-war is still

partially sunk in one of the entrances of the harbour, and I am assured there were not more than fifty Russians killed, and those nearly all soldiers, by the attack of the combined fleets on the fortifications. The powder magazine is on a granite rock inside the harbour, and as none of the bombs or shells appear to have reached it, it was not blown up. Some of the roofs of the houses here are painted green, and the domes, five in number, of the principal church a rich blue with gilt stars, which gives it rather a gay appearance. There is a college here of about 400 students, of which the present Emperor, before the death of his father, was president, and he appears to be a great favourite here.'

'Tamersfors: 9th mo: 17, 1856.

'2 o'clock.—We arrived here about an hour ago. We were unable to get our carriage and start off, until about one o'clock yesterday, and we posted all night; it took us about twenty-four hours to come the hundred and fifty miles. F. Uhden had written to us at Abo yesterday. T. Harvey has seen him, and he is to call upon us presently. I was anxious to push on here, fearing he might have left home to meet us at Abo. We found the roads better than I expected, and got some sleep in our carriage, though it is open in front. Thomas Harvey tells me it has cost us about 3*l.* to come here from Helsingfors, or about 4½*d.* per mile for three horses, double fares for driving, and our meals on the road; in England it would have cost near 20*l.* A great part of the road has been through pine forest, sometimes interspersed with silver birch. Since daylight this morning we have seen many lakes, some of them of great extent, and the scenery round them often very beautiful. We have been told that one-third of Finland is lake and one-third granite.

'6th. 2 o'clock.—Ferdinand Uhden has been with us most of the afternoon, and we are very much pleased with him. He enters heartily into the object of our mission, and thinks it will have a very good moral effect. He is lame himself, but has furnished us with an interpreter, and gives us introductions which he thinks will enable us to get at all the facts

of the case we want within fifty miles of Abo; and he is willing, in concert with some other gentlemen on whom he can fully depend, to see that the subscriptions from England are applied, as far as is possible, to the parties we wish should be relieved. We start for Abo at four o'clock to-morrow morning, and hope to get there at ten o'clock to-morrow night. Thy letter only got here, I believe, yesterday; the post has just left for England *viâ* Petersburg, and is a fortnight in going; so I mean to post my next letters from Abo. We have been to look at the factory with which F. U. is connected; they employ about 1,000 hands, and the fall of water is at the bottom of a lake about 100 miles long. The history of its establishment is almost as romantic as the scenery by which it is surrounded; but I am too tired to tell it to-night, and we are to see F. U. again. The present Emperor, and all his brothers with him, were here last winter and dined with them, and he says that when the children in their Sunday-school sang a hymn to him he saw the tears in his eyes, and afterwards he pronounced his blessing upon them.'

'Abo: Sept. 19.

'Yesterday morning we started about half-past five o'clock, accompanied by a young man as interpreter. We also brought our sailor on here. Though the day was mostly wet, we could but enjoy the splendid scenery on the lakes. They are studded with islands, clothed with beautiful timber, so placed and planted by nature that it would have been almost impossible to have done it with more effect had they been arranged by the most skilful landscape gardener. In consequence of the badness of the roads from the rainy weather, we did not arrive here until about five o'clock this morning instead of about eleven at night as we hoped. The posting horses were much worse than they were in Russia, and though we took one more than the usual number, they had been so badly jaded that at some of the stages they were unable to go much beyond a walking pace; and though our carriage has held out quite as well as we could expect, yet with six persons and luggage, and going at times very fast over very bad roads,

it is not surprising that one of the springs gave way yesterday afternoon, and but for the skill of our sailor interpreter in the use of rope, combined with that of a Finlander at one of the stations in the use of his hatchet and knife, by which they patched it up so that it carried us well here, we might have been detained a day by it. We are here at a comfortable hotel, called also the Society House; and after getting a few hours' rest in bed, and a good breakfast, we both, I think, feel as well as when we left home. We have just been to call upon Enrick Julin, to whom Ferdinand Uhden had already written to inform him of the object of our journey, and one of our letters from Newcastle was also addressed. As far as we can judge, it would have been almost impossible to have found a man more suited to give us advice and counsel. He does not speak English, but he has a son about twenty-five or thirty who does, and who interpreted in this case for us, and who appeared to enter into all his father's views and feelings; indeed it is a privilege to see such apparent noble qualities in two generations of the same family. He (the son) is going to start with us as far as Nyistad and Raumo at five o'clock to-morrow morning, and we shall probably not be back here until third day morning, but it will probably not be needful for us to go farther north. Thomas Harvey has just been remarking that things have fallen in so well without our contriving, that we may hope it is a providential indication that our mission is a right one—a feeling that I have been encouraged with before he mentioned it. I seemed to require something of this—for in some of the friends on whose judgment I a good deal rely, I thought there was rather more of sympathy with me than with the object, and I was at one time led to fear from this that I undertook it in my own will, and perhaps improperly influenced by Providence having placed at my disposal a sum of money which I could thus apply with a due regard to other claims upon me.'

'Abo: 9th mo: 22, 1856.

' . . . As John Julin is pressed for time, we entered at once on the examination of some who were sent for to give

proof of the way our soldiers had robbed them of their little property. This occupied us about two hours, and we started about three o'clock for Raumo, where we arrived about eight. On second day morning we saw and examined several cases in which the British had plundered the poor people; but Thomas Harvey has taken down the particulars of these, and you can get a copy of them on our return. One case was particularly touching—that of a poor widow of very interesting appearance, who wept much while she gave her statement, which was that the British had destroyed her husband's little vessel, and also their cargo of wood which was on shore, which included not only the whole of their own small property of about 50*l.*, but that of some friends who had helped them to build the vessel. Her husband died two or three months ago, of what would be called a broken heart, and left her with a child of four years of age, not only without support, but she would have to go through the bankruptcy court. This was fully confirmed by others.'

In a report of their mission, printed, but not published, on their return, the deputation stated that they found the good feeling previously existing among the population towards England was changed in the breasts of many into one of bitter animosity. 'Exasperation and burning indignation' were the words employed to describe to them the feeling that prevailed. But they add:—

'We must do the persons we examined the justice to say that no disposition was shown to exaggerate their grievances. The merchants did not obtrude their own losses on our notice, and we ascertained them only by direct inquiry. Need it be said that it was evident the reputation of our country had suffered deeply in the estimation of those simple, honest-hearted people, through the lawless proceedings of our navy? Formerly, no country stood so high in the esteem and affection of the Finn; but now, as one of the poor fishermen said to us, "they can't think of the English as before." The more intelligent, of course, made distinctions, as thus: "The

navy is not the nation," and "There are rascals in every country," &c. F. Uhden had before remarked to us that the printing of 100,000 copies, by the British and Foreign Bible Society, of the New Testament, and the Psalms, in their own language, had made a deep impression on the Finnish people; but after the ravages committed on the property of unarmed and unoffending fishermen and peasants, during the war, the cry was, "Can these be the English—our friends?" to which he sometimes replied, "The English who send you the Bible are not the same persons as the English who carry on the war."

Before Messrs. Sturge and Harvey quitted the country a committee was formed at Abo, consisting of Ferdinand Uhden, Erick Julin, John Julin, and a number of other respectable merchants, who undertook, subject to the approval of Count Berg, Governor General of Finland, which after some hesitation was obtained, on the application of Joseph Sturge, to distribute any funds that might be placed at their disposal for the relief of the poorer sort of persons who had suffered during the war.

It had been the intention of Joseph Sturge to proceed from St. Petersburg to the shores of the Sea of Azoff, and endeavour there to make a similar investigation for the same object. His friend Joseph Cooper had undertaken to accompany him on that part of the journey, and had proceeded as far as Riga with that view. But, after reaching the capital, the consideration of the lateness of the season, and some uncertainty which then existed, but which was afterwards happily removed, as to the willingness of the Russian Government to allow of the distribution of relief from England, determined him to return home direct.

As the distress of the poor people seemed urgent, Joseph Sturge and his companion at once authorised the

local committee to expend 20,000 silver roubles, which, on behalf of a committee to be formed in England, they engaged to furnish. As soon as they reached this country a private appeal was prepared and a subscription started, headed by Joseph and Charles Sturge with the munificent sum of 1,000*l*. Their first idea was to appeal only to their personal friends, in order out of the funds so raised to reimburse some of the poorest of those that had been despoiled, and especially to replace boats, nets, and other articles, which not only constituted their property, but were their means of subsistence. But it soon became apparent that the failure of the crops and the early closing of the navigation, owing to the severity of the winter 1856-7, coming upon the previous sufferings of the war, would plunge the inhabitants of a considerable part of the Grand Duchy into the extremity of distress. The committee formed on the return of Messrs. Sturge and Harvey determined, therefore, to give a wider scope to their applications. Mr. Sturge worked indefatigably in promoting this object. Eventually a sum of nearly 9,000*l*. was raised, the contributors being principally, though by no means exclusively, members of the Society of Friends, while the administration of the fund was left entirely in the hands of that body. This duty they performed with their wonted energy and discretion. With the money so raised, corn, meal, potatoes, 'clothing for naked children,' seed-corn for future harvests, fishing nets, &c. were purchased and distributed among the people, the native merchants and the Lutheran clergy gladly undertaking all the details. It is hardly necessary to say that this work of Christian charity was attended with the happiest effects, not only in relieving the distress of the people, but in softening their hearts. 'On behalf of all the suffering poor,' wrote one corre-

spondent, 'who have received food and clothes out of the 50*l*. received from you for that purpose, I beg to return you their most heartfelt thanks. "God bless the English gentlemen!" has already been uttered by many lips.' 'We wish,' said another, 'to express the joy which this subscription has excited, both amongst us and amongst all our friends who have already been informed of it, not only on account of the relief afforded, but also for the sympathy shown for our country.' And Mr. E. Julin of Abo, writing to Mr. Sturge, says, after describing the use he had made of the money entrusted to him:—'I shall consider the thought of having happened to be the means of accomplishing so blessed a work, as a complete compensation. I am sure that the feeling of good-will of the Finnish nation towards England and Englishmen, that certainly became weakened during the war, is now regained, which may be observed in part by the spirit in which the certificates are written.' The 'certificates' referred to were a kind of receipt given by those to whom aid was granted. And a deputation of Friends, consisting of Mr. Wilson Sturge (one of Joseph Sturge's nephews) and Mr. George Baker, who went to Finland in 1857 to visit the places to which help had been sent, were able to conclude their report thus:—

'We believe it will be gratifying to the Committee, and to the subscribers generally, to learn that those feelings of hostility and bitterness towards England on the part of the Finns, which were caused by the wanton and unjustifiable destruction of private property by our cruisers during the war, and the reports of which had not been exaggerated, are now being effectually removed by the knowledge that the friendly hand of help from England has been spontaneously and generously extended towards them, at a time when Finland was suffering from famine and its attendant evils.'

And finally, Joseph Sturge received through the secretary of the Embassy in London, Baron Nicolay, the following graceful acknowledgment of the generous kindness shown by himself and his co-subscribers to the poor Finlanders, from the Emperor of Russia :—

‘Russian Embassy, London : July 13, 1857.

‘DEAR SIR,—In the absence of H. E. Count Chreptowich, I have been instructed, by command of the Emperor, to convey to the subscribers to the fund which has been raised in this country for the purpose of alleviating the calamities of famine in Finland, His Imperial Majesty’s thanks for their liberal and charitable donations.

‘To you, sir, and your friends, to whose generous exertions on behalf of my unfortunate countrymen these thanks are especially due, I address myself, in the hope that you will kindly enable me to fulfil the orders I have received, by making known to the numerous subscribers who responded to your appeal the grateful sense His Imperial Majesty entertains of their conduct.

‘Believe me, dear sir, to be yours sincerely,

‘NICOLAY

‘To Joseph Sturge, Esq.’

We need not wonder to hear, that when three years afterwards tidings of his death reached the shores of the Baltic, there were mourning and tears in the cottages of Finnish fishermen and peasants. Joseph Sturge had tried Christ’s method of conquering an enemy, ‘If thine enemy hunger, feed him ; if he thirst, give him to drink :’ and he had succeeded in winning the only victory really worth winning, that which ‘slays the enmity’ and subdues the affections of the heart. Justly, therefore, did Mr. Whittier give to the beautiful poem he wrote on hearing of his friend’s mission—and

which we are very sure our readers will thank us for reproducing here—the title of

THE CONQUEST OF FINLAND.*

Across the frozen marshes
The winds of autumn blow,
And the fen-lands of the Wetter
Are white with early snow.

But where the low grey headlands
Look o'er the Baltic brine,
A bark is sailing in the track
Of England's battle-line.

No wares hath she to barter
For Bothnia's fish and grain :
She saileth not for pleasure,
She saileth not for gain.

But still by isle or mainland
She drops her anchor down,
Where'er the British cannon
Rained fire on tower and town.

Out spoke the ancient Amptman,
At the gate of Helsingfors :
'Why comes this ship a-spying
In track of England's wars ?'

'God bless her,' said the coast-guard,
'God bless the ship, I say ;
The holy angels trim the sails
That speed her on her way !

'Where'er she drops her anchor,
The peasant's heart is glad :
Where'er she spreads her parting sail,
The peasant's heart is sad.

'Each wasted town and hamlet
She visits to restore :
To roof the shattered cabin,
And feed the starving poor.

* A late letter from England, in the *Friends' Review*, says : 'Joseph Sturge with a companion, Thomas Harvey, has been visiting the shores of Finland to ascertain the amount of mischief and loss to the poor and peaceable sufferers occasioned by the gunboats of the allied squadrons in the late war, with a view to obtaining relief for them.'—*Mr. Whittier's note.*

'The sunken boats of fishers,
The foraged beeves and grain,
The spoil of flake and storehouse,
The good ship brings again.

'And so to Finland's sorrow
The sweet amend is made,
As if the healing hand of Christ
Upon her wounds were laid.'

Then said the grey old Amptman,
'The will of God be done!
The battle lost by England's hate
By England's love is won!

'We braved the iron tempest,
That thundered on our shore,
But when did kindness fail to find
The key to Finland's door?

'No more from Aland's ramparts
Shall warning signal come,
Nor startled Sweaborg hear again
The roll of midnight drum.

'Beside our fierce black eagle
The dove of Peace shall rest;
And in the mouth of cannon
The sea-bird make her nest.

'For Finland, looking seaward,
No coming foe can scan;
And the holy bells of Abo
Shall ring "Good-will to man!"

'Then row thy boat, O fisher!
In peace on lake and bay;
And thou, young maiden, dance again
Around the poles of May.

'Sit down old men together,
Old wives in quiet spin;
Henceforth the Anglo-Saxon
Is brother of the Finn!' -

CHAPTER XXVI.

NEW JOURNALS—INDIAN MUTINY—SIR JAMES BROOKE.

The Peace Party not fairly represented in the Press—Effect of this during the Russian War—Remedy for this Evil—Mr. Sturge's Reluctance to take the matter in hand—At last consents, and prosecutes it with great Energy—The 'Morning' and 'Evening Star' started—The Indian Mutiny—Mr. Sturge's dissatisfaction with our Policy in the East—Letters on the Mutiny—His Desire for an Enquiry into Native Grievances—Consults Mr. Dickinson of the India Reform Association—Offers to bear the Expense of a Commission to India—Could not find a suitable Person for the Service—Determines to go himself—Invites the Biographer to accompany him—Reasons why this Design was not accomplished—Sir James Brooke—Proposition urged upon the Chambers of Commerce—Mr. Sturge opposes it at Birmingham—The Reasons why—Buys an Estate in the West Indies.

WE must now advert to another enterprise in which Mr. Sturge was engaged in the years 1855-56, and which was singularly illustrative of the indomitable energy of his character. It had long been felt by the Peace party in this country that they were placed at great disadvantage by the want of an organ among the daily press, which should fairly interpret and firmly maintain and defend their principles before the world. This inconvenience became more than ever apparent at the time of the Russian war; for during that paroxysm of national passion all the ordinary laws of fair play were habitually violated, as respects the men of peace, by the journals which had then exclusive possession of the public ear. Not only were their views misrepresented, their measures caricatured, and their motives maligned,

but it was next to impossible to have facts, documents, and public proceedings bearing on their side of the question fairly reported. It was determined therefore, that as soon as those fiscal laws relative to the press which were then in operation, and which were justly described as 'taxes on knowledge,' were partially repealed, an effort should be made to start a paper, not, indeed, to be the organ of the Peace Society, or to propagate what are called 'the extreme views' held by the Society of Friends and others on the subject of war; but a paper that, combined with the advocacy of all liberal principles, should specially contend for a pacific policy at home and abroad, and commend to the country and to the world such principles as those of non-intervention, the settlement of international disputes by arbitration, and the gradual and simultaneous reduction of European armaments. But when it came to be considered how this project was to be carried into effect, all eyes, as usual, turned to Joseph Sturge as the man that was to do it, if it were to be done. At first, and for some time, he displayed unwonted repugnance to take the matter in hand. He had often before, he said, been concerned either in establishing, or helping to sustain newspapers started avowedly for the diffusion, and defence of certain principles. But with one or two exceptions, to which he referred, the results had not been satisfactory. Generally, they had by degrees, in their anxiety to catch the breeze of popular favour, swerved widely from the course they had professed and promised to follow, and in some cases he and his friends had had the mortification of feeling that the money and influence they had contributed to such undertakings were actually employed to give currency to a spirit and to principles utterly alien from those which they

When the awful details of the mutiny reached this country, Joseph Sturge, while sharing in the universal horror at the sanguinary outrages of the Sepoys, could not separate these acts from the previous history of our dealings in India. Writing to an American friend, January 22, 1858, he says:—

‘It would appear as though Providence were about to visit us for our national guilt by this rebellion in India. I doubt if there are much blacker pages in history than those which record our conduct in India and China. Many of the facts have never fully come to light, but there were enough known to have induced a Christian nation to put a stop to it. It is not those only who were interested in ravaging and plundering those countries that are guilty, but I fear that the great bulk of our people, not excepting ministers of religion, have actively or passively sanctioned it. . . . Had we acted on Christian principles in our government of India, even though we obtained much of it by robbery, the present state of things would not have existed, and yet the advocates of war are ready enough to ask the Friends of Peace how *they* would now get out of a position in which they would never have placed themselves. I never saw more clearly the importance of the existence of a Society like ours (the Society of Friends), upholding the full principles of peace, and I cannot help regretting its rapid decrease.’

Mr. Sturge, however, was not a man to be content with lamenting past evils. As usual, he began to ask the question, *What can be done?* He wholly disbelieved the theory that the outbreak in India was a mere wanton display of ingratitude towards a benign and paternal Government. He had examined the question for himself, and he knew that the natives of that country had ample ground for complaints, however much he deplored the means they had taken of attempting to redress their own wrongs. But the form in which the matter presented

itself to the mind of Mr. Sturge was this: Would it not be right and wise to institute an enquiry into the grievances of the people? Would it not tend to allay the violence of their hostility if they knew that there were Englishmen who, while utterly execrating the frantic excesses into which they had plunged, had nevertheless so much sense of justice and sympathy with their wrongs, as to be anxious to ascertain from themselves what it was they complained of, and how their condition might be bettered? He thought, moreover, that the English people, roused for the moment at least out of the criminal apathy with which it had been their wont to turn aside from all Indian questions, might be disposed now to listen with some interest to the results of an honest investigation, conducted on the spot, into matters connected with the well-being of a hundred millions of their fellow-subjects, and the future prosperity of their great Indian Empire. His desire was, therefore, that some sort of voluntary commission should go out to India, consisting of a person or persons who should be so introduced to the natives as to command their confidence and elicit from them a full statement of the grounds of their disaffection. It was suggested that probably the Government might be induced to appoint a Royal Commission, after the suppression of the mutiny, to undertake such a work as he contemplated. But this did not at all meet his views. He knew from his West India experience that official investigations were seldom to be trusted—that to get access really to the *people* and such among the European settlers as were the people's friends, those who made the enquiry should be free from all suspicion of bearing any official character. Writing to the biographer on this subject, February 2, 1858, he says:—

‘I would just say, that with the strong probability that a Royal Commission would not be formed of the right men, and the great evils of unavoidable delay even if it were, I doubt very much if this would be a wise course, even if it could be obtained. The evils of the present system are admitted by all but those who are blinded by self-interest, and the dreadful injustice to the natives is palpable to the mind of every honest man who has looked at a tithe of the evidence now in our possession; and if it be possible properly to govern India in future, I doubt if there were ever a better opportunity than there is now that the old system is broken up, to introduce better methods of government, or at least to make the arrangements for doing so in a way that should convince the natives we wish to do them justice.’

Mr. Sturge had often before been in communication with Mr. John Dickinson of the India Reform Association, a gentleman whose knowledge of all Indian questions is unrivalled, and whose long and unselfish devotion to the interests of the natives and to the cause of good government in that country none more cordially admired than he did. He now signified to Mr. Dickinson that if he knew and could recommend any individual suitable and prepared to go, and do the work he desired to have done, he would make himself responsible for all the expenses of the mission. After considerable enquiry, however, none such appeared to present himself. He then applied to one or two of his own friends in whose judgment and general competency he had great confidence, in the hope that they might be persuaded to undertake the duty. Having failed also in this direction, he determined to go to India himself, if he could secure the help of a colleague of like convictions and sympathies with himself. Towards the end of 1857 the writer of this biography was on the eve of escaping from London for a few days into the country, to seek a little rest after

rather exhausting labour, when he received the following communication from Mr. Sturge :—

‘I am very sorry to delay thy visit to thy brother, but I want to see thee on a matter of so much importance, that I must beg thee not to leave until Saturday morning. I hope to get to Broad Street by one o’clock on Friday, but I shall probably wish thee to go with me and call upon one or two other persons.’

At this interview he repeated the ‘strong concern’ he felt (to use his own significant Quaker phrase) as to the condition of India, and his duty to try to do something that might help to secure to the oppressed natives such treatment for the future as might make some amends for the past. He dwelt with most unaffected humility upon the consciousness he felt of his own inadequacy for such an enterprise, but nevertheless expressed his firm resolve, since no one else seemed ready to undertake it, to do the best he could, if the writer felt justified in joining him in the mission. He added that we might induce one or two other friends to associate themselves with us. There was so much of noble self-devotion in the proposal, and so much of religious earnestness in the spirit in which it was made, that the writer did not dare to refuse. After taking some time to consider, therefore, he signified to his honoured friend his determination not to fail him on such an occasion. He ventured, however, to suggest some of the difficulties that might stand in the way of a satisfactory accomplishment of the proposed mission at that particular time. In reply to this Mr. Sturge wrote :—

‘I have endeavoured to weigh, as well as I can, the objections and the difficulties of a deputation such as thou and I, and one or two others, going out to India. And though no

doubt the obstacles are great in the way of obtaining complete information, yet a few persons like —— on the spot might greatly help us. Even if we were unable to travel in some parts of the country, yet information obtained, were it only at second-hand, from those who had been witnesses of the evils they describe, if properly attested and coming through persons of veracity who had gone out with no other purpose than to promote the happiness of India by its future good government, would, while the attention of the public is alive to the subject, be received, I expect, with nearly as much interest as though the parties had been to the particular localities and seen for themselves. . . . I should like to know from John Dickinson how far he thinks persons residing at the capitals of the Presidencies would be willing to communicate to persons recommended to their confidence the facts relating to the past grievances of the people, and whether the natives themselves, or the most enlightened of them, could offer any suggestions as to how these grievances could be most effectually remedied for the future.'

He had prepared a programme of the work which he thought the deputation ought to attempt to do. It lies before us now in his own handwriting.

'The following are some of the objects in which it is thought a suitable deputation to India might be useful:

'To afford to the natives an opportunity of fully and freely communicating their grievances, and to try to ascertain from them in what way they could be redressed and prevented in future.

'To ascertain, as far as practicable, both from natives and those Europeans who sincerely desire the welfare of India, what course of policy on the part of England would be most likely to promote the future prosperity and happiness of the native population, and to secure their attachment to this country.

'To examine into the whole circumstances connected with the cultivation of, and trade in, Opium.

‘To ascertain what are the obstacles to the cultivation and export of sugar of a quality and at a price which shall supersede the slave-grown produce of the Western world, and how they may best be increased.

‘To establish a permanent association in India to report to friends of India in England anything requiring redress or attention.

‘To bring home one or more natives, if it is found desirable to do so, who shall be capable of informing the people of England respecting the grievances of India, and how they may be remedied.’

Thus, in the sixty-fifth year of his age, with his health greatly enfeebled, and conscious, as we shall presently see, of his own approaching dissolution, was he prepared to leave the home that was so dear to him, to brave the dangers of climate, and all the horrors and hazards of that time of anarchy and war, with no expectation of gain or glory, but moved solely by sympathy for the wrongs of the poor natives of India, and a patriotic concern for the true honour of England. His designs, indeed, were not accomplished. After frequent and earnest consultation with gentlemen intimately conversant with India, it was felt that the disturbed state of the country, and the extreme terror and jealousy which had taken possession of the native mind, would have rendered it impossible, at that time, to conduct such an enquiry as Mr. Sturge contemplated with any satisfactory result. But surely we may well believe that the Great Master must have pronounced over His faithful servant’s unselfish purpose—‘Thou did’st well that it was in thine heart.’

About the end of 1858 and the beginning of 1859, Mr. Sturge performed the last public duty in which he was engaged as a citizen of Birmingham. It related to a subject that we have no doubt was sufficiently dis-

tasteful to him ; but, as he felt it *was* a duty, he dared not and did not shrink from it, at whatever sacrifice of feeling to himself. About that time great efforts were being made to move the Chambers of Commerce in different parts of the kingdom to petition parliament and to memorialise her Majesty's ministers in reference to Sir James Brooke and his territory of Sarawak, urging the claims of the former to the favourable consideration of the Government, and praying that the latter, by purchase or protectorate, or some other means, might be brought more directly under the sovereignty of England. When a proposal of this nature was made in the Birmingham Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Sturge felt himself obliged strongly to resist it. He would, probably, at any time, have gravely doubted the wisdom of extending our territorial possessions in the East ; but it seemed especially absurd to do so at the very moment when the bloody drama then being enacted on the peninsula of India was proving so signally how little able we were to govern satisfactorily those we had already acquired. But even if he had not felt that general objection, he would none the less have opposed this particular acquisition. It is hardly necessary to say that he had no personal animosity towards Sir James Brooke. Indeed it may be very confidently affirmed that he had no personal animosity towards any human being. But he had watched that gentleman's course with great attention, and some of his proceedings appeared to him to be of a character which rendered it very undesirable that the Government of this country should approve and virtually adopt them by an act of official recognition, such as that now pressed upon them by his friends. No doubt Mr. Sturge, like many others, had followed the early career of Mr. Brooke in the

Malayan Archipelago with no little interest; for it was understood that he was a professed philanthropist, whose object was not to advance the ends of personal interest or ambition, but to extend commerce, civilisation, and Christianity in those remote regions. But in process of time rumours reached this country that he was adopting what appeared to some persons very singular means for promoting such objects. First came an account of a frightful slaughter of the Dyaks, not because they had made any attack upon the settlement at Sarawak, but on the vague general charge of their being pirates. Then there came revelations tending to show that the mode by which Rajah Brooke had got possession of the province over which he claimed sovereignty was, to say the least, of a very questionable sort. Still later, indeed within two years of the time when the application of which we have spoken was being made to the Chambers of Commerce, there had been another terrible slaughter at Sarawak, though it had been previously represented as being in a state of perfect peace and contentment under the rule of its European Rajah. It was upon certain Chinese settlers in the province that destruction fell this time. What the nature of the quarrel was has never been made very clear; but there was no obscurity as to the extent and severity of the vengeance taken. These were the words of Sir James Brooke himself:—‘Out of a population of 4,000 or 5,000, certainly not more than 2,000 have escaped; one-half of this number being composed of women and children.’ Now, all this revolted Mr. Sturge’s principles and feelings alike. He was one of those who did not believe in promoting philanthropy by fire and blood, or in reclaiming savages by adopting and exaggerating their own savage practices. Neither

cherished, and had hoped to subserve. His objections, however, were ultimately overcome, and when he did take the work in hand, he prosecuted it with an energy and persistency that were irresistible. Others might and did hesitate, and waver, and become discouraged. But he did not; having once taken the purpose to heart, he held it with a firm resolve, and would not rest until it was translated into act. By journeys, correspondences, conferences, and the use of the great influence he possessed, especially in his own Society, he secured the means that were necessary, and surmounted all the obstacles that stood in the way of accomplishing the object. From a large number of letters on the subject to the biographer, who had long and strenuously pressed this matter upon his friend, it is only necessary to cite one, dated September 9, 1855 :—

‘MY DEAR FRIEND,—I returned from my journey to the North this week, and have succeeded quite as well as I expected with regard to funds for the paper. The question now is to have it put on quite a safe footing with regard to its principles, and I see this will greatly depend upon getting the right man for the chief editor. I had a satisfactory interview with — and — at Manchester, and have no doubt of their doing what they can to secure this. The paper, I fear, cannot be out before the end of the year, but they think it possible they will be able to get a press to throw off 24,000 per hour. They were not prepared to fix a day for our meeting in Manchester. When shalt thou be back? I am uneasy that we are doing so little just now. Though, with the press all against us, our lectures would not be reported, we might still do something by tracts and placards.’

Ultimately he had the satisfaction of seeing the ‘Morning’ and ‘Evening Star’ fairly launched; and we can form no better wish for these journals, if they would subserve the cause of truth, justice, and humanity, than

that they should be conducted as much as possible on the principles and in the spirit of Joseph Sturge.

It will be remembered how, about the middle of 1857, England and the world were startled by that fearful volcanic eruption in India which so rudely disturbed our long dream of security and shook the foundation of our empire in that country. Joseph Sturge, like many other Christian men, had long had a fear lying heavily upon his heart, that the high-handed policy we had been and still were pursuing in the East must sooner or later entail upon us a bitter retribution. The recent bombardment of Canton, and the war with China to which it had led, and which, indeed, was then on hand, had only served to deepen that conviction. In a letter under date of April 4, 1857, written to a friend who had invited him to join in some form of appeal or remonstrance to the Americans on the subject of slavery, he declines the invitation, and says :—

‘The fact is, I think nations as well as individuals should take the beam out of their own eye before they attempt to draw the mote out of their brother’s eye. While we have such dreadful national guilt lying at our own door, in connection with our wars and massacres, I think it is everyone’s Christian duty to try to get these things put a stop to before we cast a stone at the guilt of other nations, even though it be that of slavery in the United States. As to uniting in such an act with —, or anyone who has sanctioned the Canton massacre, I cannot do it. Were I an American slaveholder, or supporter of slavery, I believe I should consider it mere hypocrisy and cant to appeal to me to alter my views or conduct on the ground of Christianity or humanity, while we are approving such deeds at home. This does not apply, I know, to some of our anti-slavery friends, and perhaps to none of those who have signed the document in question, but I feel that any little strength I have left to labour should be now directed into a different channel.’

When the awful details of the mutiny reached this country, Joseph Sturge, while sharing in the universal horror at the sanguinary outrages of the Sepoys, could not separate these acts from the previous history of our dealings in India. Writing to an American friend, January 22, 1858, he says:—

‘It would appear as though Providence were about to visit us for our national guilt by this rebellion in India. I doubt if there are much blacker pages in history than those which record our conduct in India and China. Many of the facts have never fully come to light, but there were enough known to have induced a Christian nation to put a stop to it. It is not those only who were interested in ravaging and plundering those countries that are guilty, but I fear that the great bulk of our people, not excepting ministers of religion, have actively or passively sanctioned it. . . . Had we acted on Christian principles in our government of India, even though we obtained much of it by robbery, the present state of things would not have existed, and yet the advocates of war are ready enough to ask the Friends of Peace how *they* would now get out of a position in which they would never have placed themselves. I never saw more clearly the importance of the existence of a Society like ours (the Society of Friends), upholding the full principles of peace, and I cannot help regretting its rapid decrease.’

Mr. Sturge, however, was not a man to be content with lamenting past evils. As usual, he began to ask the question, *What can be done?* He wholly disbelieved the theory that the outbreak in India was a mere wanton display of ingratitude towards a benign and paternal Government. He had examined the question for himself, and he knew that the natives of that country had ample ground for complaints, however much he deplored the means they had taken of attempting to redress their own wrongs. But the form in which the matter presented

itself to the mind of Mr. Sturge was this: Would it not be right and wise to institute an enquiry into the grievances of the people? Would it not tend to allay the violence of their hostility if they knew that there were Englishmen who, while utterly execrating the frantic excesses into which they had plunged, had nevertheless so much sense of justice and sympathy with their wrongs, as to be anxious to ascertain from themselves what it was they complained of, and how their condition might be bettered? He thought, moreover, that the English people, roused for the moment at least out of the criminal apathy with which it had been their wont to turn aside from all Indian questions, might be disposed now to listen with some interest to the results of an honest investigation, conducted on the spot, into matters connected with the well-being of a hundred millions of their fellow-subjects, and the future prosperity of their great Indian Empire. His desire was, therefore, that some sort of voluntary commission should go out to India, consisting of a person or persons who should be so introduced to the natives as to command their confidence and elicit from them a full statement of the grounds of their disaffection. It was suggested that probably the Government might be induced to appoint a Royal Commission, after the suppression of the mutiny, to undertake such a work as he contemplated. But this did not at all meet his views. He knew from his West India experience that official investigations were seldom to be trusted—that to get access really to the *people* and such among the European settlers as were the people's friends, those who made the enquiry should be free from all suspicion of bearing any official character. Writing to the biographer on this subject, February 2, 1858, he says:—

‘I would just say, that with the strong probability that a Royal Commission would not be formed of the right men, and the great evils of unavoidable delay even if it were, I doubt very much if this would be a wise course, even if it could be obtained. The evils of the present system are admitted by all but those who are blinded by self-interest, and the dreadful injustice to the natives is palpable to the mind of every honest man who has looked at a tithe of the evidence now in our possession; and if it be possible properly to govern India in future, I doubt if there were ever a better opportunity than there is now that the old system is broken up, to introduce better methods of government, or at least to make the arrangements for doing so in a way that should convince the natives we wish to do them justice.’

Mr. Sturge had often before been in communication with Mr. John Dickinson of the India Reform Association, a gentleman whose knowledge of all Indian questions is unrivalled, and whose long and unselfish devotion to the interests of the natives and to the cause of good government in that country none more cordially admired than he did. He now signified to Mr. Dickinson that if he knew and could recommend any individual suitable and prepared to go, and do the work he desired to have done, he would make himself responsible for all the expenses of the mission. After considerable enquiry, however, none such appeared to present himself. He then applied to one or two of his own friends in whose judgment and general competency he had great confidence, in the hope that they might be persuaded to undertake the duty. Having failed also in this direction, he determined to go to India himself, if he could secure the help of a colleague of like convictions and sympathies with himself. Towards the end of 1857 the writer of this biography was on the eve of escaping from London for a few days into the country, to seek a little rest after

rather exhausting labour, when he received the following communication from Mr. Sturge :—

‘I am very sorry to delay thy visit to thy brother, but I want to see thee on a matter of so much importance, that I must beg thee not to leave until Saturday morning. I hope to get to Broad Street by one o’clock on Friday, but I shall probably wish thee to go with me and call upon one or two other persons.’

At this interview he repeated the ‘strong concern’ he felt (to use his own significant Quaker phrase) as to the condition of India, and his duty to try to do something that might help to secure to the oppressed natives such treatment for the future as might make some amends for the past. He dwelt with most unaffected humility upon the consciousness he felt of his own inadequacy for such an enterprise, but nevertheless expressed his firm resolve, since no one else seemed ready to undertake it, to do the best he could, if the writer felt justified in joining him in the mission. He added that we might induce one or two other friends to associate themselves with us. There was so much of noble self-devotion in the proposal, and so much of religious earnestness in the spirit in which it was made, that the writer did not dare to refuse. After taking some time to consider, therefore, he signified to his honoured friend his determination not to fail him on such an occasion. He ventured, however, to suggest some of the difficulties that might stand in the way of a satisfactory accomplishment of the proposed mission at that particular time. In reply to this Mr. Sturge wrote :—

‘I have endeavoured to weigh, as well as I can, the objections and the difficulties of a deputation such as thou and I, and one or two others, going out to India. And though no

doubt the obstacles are great in the way of obtaining complete information, yet a few persons like — on the spot might greatly help us. Even if we were unable to travel in some parts of the country, yet information obtained, were it only at second-hand, from those who had been witnesses of the evils they describe, if properly attested and coming through persons of veracity who had gone out with no other purpose than to promote the happiness of India by its future good government, would, while the attention of the public is alive to the subject, be received, I expect, with nearly as much interest as though the parties had been to the particular localities and seen for themselves. . . . I should like to know from John Dickinson how far he thinks persons residing at the capitals of the Presidencies would be willing to communicate to persons recommended to their confidence the facts relating to the past grievances of the people, and whether the natives themselves, or the most enlightened of them, could offer any suggestions as to how these grievances could be most effectually remedied for the future.'

He had prepared a programme of the work which he thought the deputation ought to attempt to do. It lies before us now in his own handwriting.

'The following are some of the objects in which it is thought a suitable deputation to India might be useful:

'To afford to the natives an opportunity of fully and freely communicating their grievances, and to try to ascertain from them in what way they could be redressed and prevented in future.

'To ascertain, as far as practicable, both from natives and those Europeans who sincerely desire the welfare of India, what course of policy on the part of England would be most likely to promote the future prosperity and happiness of the native population, and to secure their attachment to this country.

'To examine into the whole circumstances connected with the cultivation of, and trade in, Opium.

‘To ascertain what are the obstacles to the cultivation and export of sugar of a quality and at a price which shall supersede the slave-grown produce of the Western world, and how they may best be increased.

‘To establish a permanent association in India to report to friends of India in England anything requiring redress or attention.

‘To bring home one or more natives, if it is found desirable to do so, who shall be capable of informing the people of England respecting the grievances of India, and how they may be remedied.’

Thus, in the sixty-fifth year of his age, with his health greatly enfeebled, and conscious, as we shall presently see, of his own approaching dissolution, was he prepared to leave the home that was so dear to him, to brave the dangers of climate, and all the horrors and hazards of that time of anarchy and war, with no expectation of gain or glory, but moved solely by sympathy for the wrongs of the poor natives of India, and a patriotic concern for the true honour of England. His designs, indeed, were not accomplished. After frequent and earnest consultation with gentlemen intimately conversant with India, it was felt that the disturbed state of the country, and the extreme terror and jealousy which had taken possession of the native mind, would have rendered it impossible, at that time, to conduct such an enquiry as Mr. Sturge contemplated with any satisfactory result. But surely we may well believe that the Great Master must have pronounced over His faithful servant’s unselfish purpose—‘Thou did’st well that it was in thine heart.’

About the end of 1858 and the beginning of 1859, Mr. Sturge performed the last public duty in which he was engaged as a citizen of Birmingham. It related to a subject that we have no doubt was sufficiently dis-

tasteful to him ; but, as he felt it *was* a duty, he dared not and did not shrink from it, at whatever sacrifice of feeling to himself. About that time great efforts were being made to move the Chambers of Commerce in different parts of the kingdom to petition parliament and to memorialise her Majesty's ministers in reference to Sir James Brooke and his territory of Sarawak, urging the claims of the former to the favourable consideration of the Government, and praying that the latter, by purchase or protectorate, or some other means, might be brought more directly under the sovereignty of England. When a proposal of this nature was made in the Birmingham Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Sturge felt himself obliged strongly to resist it. He would, probably, at any time, have gravely doubted the wisdom of extending our territorial possessions in the East ; but it seemed especially absurd to do so at the very moment when the bloody drama then being enacted on the peninsula of India was proving so signally how little able we were to govern satisfactorily those we had already acquired. But even if he had not felt that general objection, he would none the less have opposed this particular acquisition. It is hardly necessary to say that he had no personal animosity towards Sir James Brooke. Indeed it may be very confidently affirmed that he had no personal animosity towards any human being. But he had watched that gentleman's course with great attention, and some of his proceedings appeared to him to be of a character which rendered it very undesirable that the Government of this country should approve and virtually adopt them by an act of official recognition, such as that now pressed upon them by his friends. No doubt Mr. Sturge, like many others, had followed the early career of Mr. Brooke in the

Malayan Archipelago with no little interest; for it was understood that he was a professed philanthropist, whose object was not to advance the ends of personal interest or ambition, but to extend commerce, civilisation, and Christianity in those remote regions. But in process of time rumours reached this country that he was adopting what appeared to some persons very singular means for promoting such objects. First came an account of a frightful slaughter of the Dyaks, not because they had made any attack upon the settlement at Sarawak, but on the vague general charge of their being pirates. Then there came revelations tending to show that the mode by which Rajah Brooke had got possession of the province over which he claimed sovereignty was, to say the least, of a very questionable sort. Still later, indeed within two years of the time when the application of which we have spoken was being made to the Chambers of Commerce, there had been another terrible slaughter at Sarawak, though it had been previously represented as being in a state of perfect peace and contentment under the rule of its European Rajah. It was upon certain Chinese settlers in the province that destruction fell this time. What the nature of the quarrel was has never been made very clear; but there was no obscurity as to the extent and severity of the vengeance taken. These were the words of Sir James Brooke himself:—‘Out of a population of 4,000 or 5,000, certainly not more than 2,000 have escaped; one-half of this number being composed of women and children.’ Now, all this revolted Mr. Sturge’s principles and feelings alike. He was one of those who did not believe in promoting philanthropy by fire and blood, or in reclaiming savages by adopting and exaggerating their own savage practices. Neither

had he any desire to see the buccancering system of the seventeenth century, when private adventurers went forth waging war and conquering provinces on their own account, revived in the nineteenth. He, therefore, deemed it his duty to try to persuade his fellow-citizens of Birmingham not hastily to lend their sanction to acts and proceedings which were, to use the mildest phrase, of so equivocal a nature. It is not necessary here to enter into minute details of what took place on the occasion. Suffice it to say, that when the matter was first brought forward at the Chamber in the latter part of 1858, he succeeded in persuading its members, before entertaining the proposition of Rajah Brooke, to petition for a parliamentary enquiry. On a subsequent occasion, however, a sub-committee appointed to obtain information reported rather in favour of the proposition; but before the Chamber itself met to make its final decision, Mr. Sturge sent to all the members a paper prepared with great labour and care, giving copious extracts from Sir James Brooke's own published journals and letters, with a view to throw light on his doings and designs in the East. To this he prefixed the following address :—

‘TO THE BIRMINGHAM CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

‘I respectfully, but earnestly, ask the candid perusal of the accompanying statement by every member of the Chamber before they come to a decision on the question to be submitted to them on Tuesday evening next. I think it proves beyond a doubt, that if the Chamber gives its support to the claims of Sir James Brooke, they will sanction fillibusterism and piracy from the days of Pizarro in Peru to those of Walker in Nicaragua. The authorities are given in the statement, and I conceive the sub-committee would have reported differently had the whole evidence been before them.

‘I have no personal feeling or interest in this matter, but about ten years ago I entered fully into the merits of the question. At that time more than 100,000*l.* was demanded and paid (from the taxation of this country), in a comparatively short period, as head or blood-money for the destruction of so-called pirates in the East. Of this sum 20,700*l.* was paid in reward for the murderous attack on the *Dyaks*, in 1849, at the instigation of *Rajah Brooke*; the victims on this occasion, it would appear, were without fire-arms. The efforts made at the time, in this country, did not prevent the payment of the money, but they happily produced a repeal of the disgraceful statute which authorised such payments to be made; a result which has been followed by the significant fact, that our ships of war appear to have destroyed no more (so-called) piratical vessels, or villages, in these seas, since the price of blood has been withdrawn.

‘Having discharged my duty by placing this statement in the hands of the members of the Chamber, before giving it any further publication, I feel excused from taking a prominent part in its future discussion: but I consider that the terrible slaughter of the Chinese settlers in *Sarawak*, in 1857, affords additional ground for investigation, and that the Chamber should reiterate its former resolution in favour of parliamentary enquiry.

‘JOSEPH STURGE.

‘*Birmingham*: 2nd Month, 26th, 1859.’

The Chamber, however, decided to petition in favour of taking *Sarawak* under the protection of this country, which led to the retirement of Mr. Sturge and his brother from that body. But the Government of Lord Derby, when the matter was brought before them by a large deputation of Sir James Brooke’s friends, peremptorily rejected the proposition.

One other fact we have to record, which shows how intent he was to the last on the subject of slavery and free labour. We have seen how, as a

matter both of individual conscience and of national duty, he earnestly advocated the exclusion of the sugars of Cuba from the British market. An avowed friend of free trade, he held the system of slavery and the slave trade in Cuba was subversive of its essential principles. That free labour in the long run was less costly than slavery was always his unhesitating conviction. With his usual readiness to give practical evidence of the sincerity of his views, about two years before his decease he purchased, at the request of a friend resident in one of the Leeward Islands, an old sugar estate. To reclaim such an estate, where, from want of employment and the long abandonment of all the duties of ownership, the negroes had become 'squatters' on the soil, with their previous habits of labour almost forgotten, was no easy task. It was with much pleasure and interest that he was watching the obstacles to the reorganisation of regular labour and the restoration of the estate gradually overcome, when the early death of Mr. Edward Bennett, the young but able manager, took place. His decease (when on a visit to a neighbouring island) threw a shade on Mr. Sturge's mind in connection with this experiment which the few remaining months of his life failed to efface. Mr. Bennett had gone from Birmingham, and quickly evinced a special qualification for the work. It may be supposed that the loss of one with such qualifications as manager, and soon after by the decease of Mr. Sturge, of *his* business experience and practical judgment, proved serious obstacles to the success of the experiment. The estate is, however, still maintained, and its cultivation is extending with promising results.

One of the things that afforded most pleasure to Mr. Sturge at the close of life was the return of Mr. Bright

as member for Birmingham in 1858. He rejoiced over that event not merely on account of his high esteem and admiration for Mr. Bright, but as a symptom that the nation was returning to a wiser and calmer temper now that the storm of the Russian war had subsided.

Writing to Mr. Tappan, Dec. 24, 1858, he says :—

‘Thou would perhaps see by the newspapers that John Bright was my guest while here, when he made his two famous speeches, one on parliamentary reform and the other on our foreign policy. He appears completely restored to health and vigour, and I trust God will spare him and guide him on the right hand and on the left, both spiritually and physically, and make him an agent of great usefulness in His hands. To show the position he now holds in this country, thou must know that there were about forty reporters each day taking down his speeches ; two of the papers had the whole sent them by electric telegraph, and two others (one of them the ‘Times’) had a special train to London, and the next day the speech would be read by millions. I believe the moral effect was very powerful. How fickle is public opinion, for this man was burnt in effigy by the rabble during the Russian war, at Manchester, and afterwards rejected by the majority of the electors, while the week before last he was received in that city by one of the largest and most influential meetings ever assembled there, with almost unbounded applause.’

‘I would just say, that with the strong probability that a Royal Commission would not be formed of the right men, and the great evils of unavoidable delay even if it were, I doubt very much if this would be a wise course, even if it could be obtained. The evils of the present system are admitted by all but those who are blinded by self-interest, and the dreadful injustice to the natives is palpable to the mind of every honest man who has looked at a tithe of the evidence now in our possession; and if it be possible properly to govern India in future, I doubt if there were ever a better opportunity than there is now that the old system is broken up, to introduce better methods of government, or at least to make the arrangements for doing so in a way that should convince the natives we wish to do them justice.’

Mr. Sturge had often before been in communication with Mr. John Dickinson of the India Reform Association, a gentleman whose knowledge of all Indian questions is unrivalled, and whose long and unselfish devotion to the interests of the natives and to the cause of good government in that country none more cordially admired than he did. He now signified to Mr. Dickinson that if he knew and could recommend any individual suitable and prepared to go, and do the work he desired to have done, he would make himself responsible for all the expenses of the mission. After considerable enquiry, however, none such appeared to present himself. He then applied to one or two of his own friends in whose judgment and general competency he had great confidence, in the hope that they might be persuaded to undertake the duty. Having failed also in this direction, he determined to go to India himself, if he could secure the help of a colleague of like convictions and sympathies with himself. Towards the end of 1857 the writer of this biography was on the eve of escaping from London for a few days into the country, to seek a little rest after

rather exhausting labour, when he received the following communication from Mr. Sturge:—

‘I am very sorry to delay thy visit to thy brother, but I want to see thee on a matter of so much importance, that I must beg thee not to leave until Saturday morning. I hope to get to Broad Street by one o’clock on Friday, but I shall probably wish thee to go with me and call upon one or two other persons.’

At this interview he repeated the ‘strong concern’ he felt (to use his own significant Quaker phrase) as to the condition of India, and his duty to try to do something that might help to secure to the oppressed natives such treatment for the future as might make some amends for the past. He dwelt with most unaffected humility upon the consciousness he felt of his own inadequacy for such an enterprise, but nevertheless expressed his firm resolve, since no one else seemed ready to undertake it, to do the best he could, if the writer felt justified in joining him in the mission. He added that we might induce one or two other friends to associate themselves with us. There was so much of noble self-devotion in the proposal, and so much of religious earnestness in the spirit in which it was made, that the writer did not dare to refuse. After taking some time to consider, therefore, he signified to his honoured friend his determination not to fail him on such an occasion. He ventured, however, to suggest some of the difficulties that might stand in the way of a satisfactory accomplishment of the proposed mission at that particular time. In reply to this Mr. Sturge wrote:—

‘I have endeavoured to weigh, as well as I can, the objections and the difficulties of a deputation such as thou and I, and one or two others, going out to India. And though no

doubt the obstacles are great in the way of obtaining complete information, yet a few persons like —— on the spot might greatly help us. Even if we were unable to travel in some parts of the country, yet information obtained, were it only at second-hand, from those who had been witnesses of the evils they describe, if properly attested and coming through persons of veracity who had gone out with no other purpose than to promote the happiness of India by its future good government, would, while the attention of the public is alive to the subject, be received, I expect, with nearly as much interest as though the parties had been to the particular localities and seen for themselves. . . . I should like to know from John Dickinson how far he thinks persons residing at the capitals of the Presidencies would be willing to communicate to persons recommended to their confidence the facts relating to the past grievances of the people, and whether the natives themselves, or the most enlightened of them, could offer any suggestions as to how these grievances could be most effectually remedied for the future.'

He had prepared a programme of the work which he thought the deputation ought to attempt to do. It lies before us now in his own handwriting.

'The following are some of the objects in which it is thought a suitable deputation to India might be useful:

'To afford to the natives an opportunity of fully and freely communicating their grievances, and to try to ascertain from them in what way they could be redressed and prevented in future.

'To ascertain, as far as practicable, both from natives and those Europeans who sincerely desire the welfare of India, what course of policy on the part of England would be most likely to promote the future prosperity and happiness of the native population, and to secure their attachment to this country.

'To examine into the whole circumstances connected with the cultivation of, and trade in, Opium.

‘To ascertain what are the obstacles to the cultivation and export of sugar of a quality and at a price which shall supersede the slave-grown produce of the Western world, and how they may best be increased.

‘To establish a permanent association in India to report to friends of India in England anything requiring redress or attention.

‘To bring home one or more natives, if it is found desirable to do so, who shall be capable of informing the people of England respecting the grievances of India, and how they may be remedied.’

Thus, in the sixty-fifth year of his age, with his health greatly enfeebled, and conscious, as we shall presently see, of his own approaching dissolution, was he prepared to leave the home that was so dear to him, to brave the dangers of climate, and all the horrors and hazards of that time of anarchy and war, with no expectation of gain or glory, but moved solely by sympathy for the wrongs of the poor natives of India, and a patriotic concern for the true honour of England. His designs, indeed, were not accomplished. After frequent and earnest consultation with gentlemen intimately conversant with India, it was felt that the disturbed state of the country, and the extreme terror and jealousy which had taken possession of the native mind, would have rendered it impossible, at that time, to conduct such an enquiry as Mr. Sturge contemplated with any satisfactory result. But surely we may well believe that the Great Master must have pronounced over His faithful servant's unselfish purpose—‘Thou did'st well that it was in thine heart.’

About the end of 1858 and the beginning of 1859, Mr. Sturge performed the last public duty in which he was engaged as a citizen of Birmingham. It related to a subject that we have no doubt was sufficiently dis-

tasteful to him ; but, as he felt it *was* a duty, he dared not and did not shrink from it, at whatever sacrifice of feeling to himself. About that time great efforts were being made to move the Chambers of Commerce in different parts of the kingdom to petition parliament and to memorialise her Majesty's ministers in reference to Sir James Brooke and his territory of Sarawak, urging the claims of the former to the favourable consideration of the Government, and praying that the latter, by purchase or protectorate, or some other means, might be brought more directly under the sovereignty of England. When a proposal of this nature was made in the Birmingham Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Sturge felt himself obliged strongly to resist it. He would, probably, at any time, have gravely doubted the wisdom of extending our territorial possessions in the East ; but it seemed especially absurd to do so at the very moment when the bloody drama then being enacted on the peninsula of India was proving so signally how little able we were to govern satisfactorily those we had already acquired. But even if he had not felt that general objection, he would none the less have opposed this particular acquisition. It is hardly necessary to say that he had no personal animosity towards Sir James Brooke. Indeed it may be very confidently affirmed that he had no personal animosity towards any human being. But he had watched that gentleman's course with great attention, and some of his proceedings appeared to him to be of a character which rendered it very undesirable that the Government of this country should approve and virtually adopt them by an act of official recognition, such as that now pressed upon them by his friends. No doubt Mr. Sturge, like many others, had followed the early career of Mr. Brooke in the

Malayan Archipelago with no little interest; for it was understood that he was a professed philanthropist, whose object was not to advance the ends of personal interest or ambition, but to extend commerce, civilisation, and Christianity in those remote regions. But in process of time rumours reached this country that he was adopting what appeared to some persons very singular means for promoting such objects. First came an account of a frightful slaughter of the Dyaks, not because they had made any attack upon the settlement at Sarawak, but on the vague general charge of their being pirates. Then there came revelations tending to show that the mode by which Rajah Brooke had got possession of the province over which he claimed sovereignty was, to say the least, of a very questionable sort. Still later, indeed within two years of the time when the application of which we have spoken was being made to the Chambers of Commerce, there had been another terrible slaughter at Sarawak, though it had been previously represented as being in a state of perfect peace and contentment under the rule of its European Rajah. It was upon certain Chinese settlers in the province that destruction fell this time. What the nature of the quarrel was has never been made very clear; but there was no obscurity as to the extent and severity of the vengeance taken. These were the words of Sir James Brooke himself:—‘Out of a population of 4,000 or 5,000, certainly not more than 2,000 have escaped; one-half of this number being composed of women and children.’ Now, all this revolted Mr. Sturge’s principles and feelings alike. He was one of those who did not believe in promoting philanthropy by fire and blood, or in reclaiming savages by adopting and exaggerating their own savage practices. Neither

When the awful details of the mutiny reached this country, Joseph Sturge, while sharing in the universal horror at the sanguinary outrages of the Sepoys, could not separate these acts from the previous history of our dealings in India. Writing to an American friend, January 22, 1858, he says:—

‘It would appear as though Providence were about to visit us for our national guilt by this rebellion in India. I doubt if there are much blacker pages in history than those which record our conduct in India and China. Many of the facts have never fully come to light, but there were enough known to have induced a Christian nation to put a stop to it. It is not those only who were interested in ravaging and plundering those countries that are guilty, but I fear that the great bulk of our people, not excepting ministers of religion, have actively or passively sanctioned it. . . . Had we acted on Christian principles in our government of India, even though we obtained much of it by robbery, the present state of things would not have existed, and yet the advocates of war are ready enough to ask the Friends of Peace how *they* would now get out of a position in which they would never have placed themselves. I never saw more clearly the importance of the existence of a Society like ours (the Society of Friends), upholding the full principles of peace, and I cannot help regretting its rapid decrease.’

Mr. Sturge, however, was not a man to be content with lamenting past evils. As usual, he began to ask the question, *What can be done?* He wholly disbelieved the theory that the outbreak in India was a mere wanton display of ingratitude towards a benign and paternal Government. He had examined the question for himself, and he knew that the natives of that country had ample ground for complaints, however much he deplored the means they had taken of attempting to redress their own wrongs. But the form in which the matter presented

itself to the mind of Mr. Sturge was this: Would it not be right and wise to institute an enquiry into the grievances of the people? Would it not tend to allay the violence of their hostility if they knew that there were Englishmen who, while utterly execrating the frantic excesses into which they had plunged, had nevertheless so much sense of justice and sympathy with their wrongs, as to be anxious to ascertain from themselves what it was they complained of, and how their condition might be bettered? He thought, moreover, that the English people, roused for the moment at least out of the criminal apathy with which it had been their wont to turn aside from all Indian questions, might be disposed now to listen with some interest to the results of an honest investigation, conducted on the spot, into matters connected with the well-being of a hundred millions of their fellow-subjects, and the future prosperity of their great Indian Empire. His desire was, therefore, that some sort of voluntary commission should go out to India, consisting of a person or persons who should be so introduced to the natives as to command their confidence and elicit from them a full statement of the grounds of their disaffection. It was suggested that probably the Government might be induced to appoint a Royal Commission, after the suppression of the mutiny, to undertake such a work as he contemplated. But this did not at all meet his views. He knew from his West India experience that official investigations were seldom to be trusted—that to get access really to the *people* and such among the European settlers as were the people's friends, those who made the enquiry should be free from all suspicion of bearing any official character. Writing to the biographer on this subject, February 2, 1858, he says:—

‘I would just say, that with the strong probability that a Royal Commission would not be formed of the right men, and the great evils of unavoidable delay even if it were, I doubt very much if this would be a wise course, even if it could be obtained. The evils of the present system are admitted by all but those who are blinded by self-interest, and the dreadful injustice to the natives is palpable to the mind of every honest man who has looked at a tithe of the evidence now in our possession; and if it be possible properly to govern India in future, I doubt if there were ever a better opportunity than there is now that the old system is broken up, to introduce better methods of government, or at least to make the arrangements for doing so in a way that should convince the natives we wish to do them justice.’

Mr. Sturge had often before been in communication with Mr. John Dickinson of the India Reform Association, a gentleman whose knowledge of all Indian questions is unrivalled, and whose long and unselfish devotion to the interests of the natives and to the cause of good government in that country none more cordially admired than he did. He now signified to Mr. Dickinson that if he knew and could recommend any individual suitable and prepared to go, and do the work he desired to have done, he would make himself responsible for all the expenses of the mission. After considerable enquiry, however, none such appeared to present himself. He then applied to one or two of his own friends in whose judgment and general competency he had great confidence, in the hope that they might be persuaded to undertake the duty. Having failed also in this direction, he determined to go to India himself, if he could secure the help of a colleague of like convictions and sympathies with himself. Towards the end of 1857 the writer of this biography was on the eve of escaping from London for a few days into the country, to seek a little rest after

rather exhausting labour, when he received the following communication from Mr. Sturge:—

‘I am very sorry to delay thy visit to thy brother, but I want to see thee on a matter of so much importance, that I must beg thee not to leave until Saturday morning. I hope to get to Broad Street by one o’clock on Friday, but I shall probably wish thee to go with me and call upon one or two other persons.’

At this interview he repeated the ‘strong concern’ he felt (to use his own significant Quaker phrase) as to the condition of India, and his duty to try to do something that might help to secure to the oppressed natives such treatment for the future as might make some amends for the past. He dwelt with most unaffected humility upon the consciousness he felt of his own inadequacy for such an enterprise, but nevertheless expressed his firm resolve, since no one else seemed ready to undertake it, to do the best he could, if the writer felt justified in joining him in the mission. He added that we might induce one or two other friends to associate themselves with us. There was so much of noble self-devotion in the proposal, and so much of religious earnestness in the spirit in which it was made, that the writer did not dare to refuse. After taking some time to consider, therefore, he signified to his honoured friend his determination not to fail him on such an occasion. He ventured, however, to suggest some of the difficulties that might stand in the way of a satisfactory accomplishment of the proposed mission at that particular time. In reply to this Mr. Sturge wrote:—

‘I have endeavoured to weigh, as well as I can, the objections and the difficulties of a deputation such as thou and I, and one or two others, going out to India. And though no

doubt the obstacles are great in the way of obtaining complete information, yet a few persons like —— on the spot might greatly help us. Even if we were unable to travel in some parts of the country, yet information obtained, were it only at second-hand, from those who had been witnesses of the evils they describe, if properly attested and coming through persons of veracity who had gone out with no other purpose than to promote the happiness of India by its future good government, would, while the attention of the public is alive to the subject, be received, I expect, with nearly as much interest as though the parties had been to the particular localities and seen for themselves. . . . I should like to know from John Dickinson how far he thinks persons residing at the capitals of the Presidencies would be willing to communicate to persons recommended to their confidence the facts relating to the past grievances of the people, and whether the natives themselves, or the most enlightened of them, could offer any suggestions as to how these grievances could be most effectually remedied for the future.'

He had prepared a programme of the work which he thought the deputation ought to attempt to do. It lies before us now in his own handwriting.

'The following are some of the objects in which it is thought a suitable deputation to India might be useful:

'To afford to the natives an opportunity of fully and freely communicating their grievances, and to try to ascertain from them in what way they could be redressed and prevented in future.

'To ascertain, as far as practicable, both from natives and those Europeans who sincerely desire the welfare of India, what course of policy on the part of England would be most likely to promote the future prosperity and happiness of the native population, and to secure their attachment to this country.

'To examine into the whole circumstances connected with the cultivation of, and trade in, Opium.

‘To ascertain what are the obstacles to the cultivation and export of sugar of a quality and at a price which shall supersede the slave-grown produce of the Western world, and how they may best be increased.

‘To establish a permanent association in India to report to friends of India in England anything requiring redress or attention.

‘To bring home one or more natives, if it is found desirable to do so, who shall be capable of informing the people of England respecting the grievances of India, and how they may be remedied.’

Thus, in the sixty-fifth year of his age, with his health greatly enfeebled, and conscious, as we shall presently see, of his own approaching dissolution, was he prepared to leave the home that was so dear to him, to brave the dangers of climate, and all the horrors and hazards of that time of anarchy and war, with no expectation of gain or glory, but moved solely by sympathy for the wrongs of the poor natives of India, and a patriotic concern for the true honour of England. His designs, indeed, were not accomplished. After frequent and earnest consultation with gentlemen intimately conversant with India, it was felt that the disturbed state of the country, and the extreme terror and jealousy which had taken possession of the native mind, would have rendered it impossible, at that time, to conduct such an enquiry as Mr. Sturge contemplated with any satisfactory result. But surely we may well believe that the Great Master must have pronounced over His faithful servant’s unselfish purpose—‘Thou did’st well that it was in thine heart.’

About the end of 1858 and the beginning of 1859, Mr. Sturge performed the last public duty in which he was engaged as a citizen of Birmingham. It related to a subject that we have no doubt was sufficiently dis-

tasteful to him ; but, as he felt it *was* a duty, he dared not and did not shrink from it, at whatever sacrifice of feeling to himself. About that time great efforts were being made to move the Chambers of Commerce in different parts of the kingdom to petition parliament and to memorialise her Majesty's ministers in reference to Sir James Brooke and his territory of Sarawak, urging the claims of the former to the favourable consideration of the Government, and praying that the latter, by purchase or protectorate, or some other means, might be brought more directly under the sovereignty of England. When a proposal of this nature was made in the Birmingham Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Sturge felt himself obliged strongly to resist it. He would, probably, at any time, have gravely doubted the wisdom of extending our territorial possessions in the East ; but it seemed especially absurd to do so at the very moment when the bloody drama then being enacted on the peninsula of India was proving so signally how little able we were to govern satisfactorily those we had already acquired. But even if he had not felt that general objection, he would none the less have opposed this particular acquisition. It is hardly necessary to say that he had no personal animosity towards Sir James Brooke. Indeed it may be very confidently affirmed that he had no personal animosity towards any human being. But he had watched that gentleman's course with great attention, and some of his proceedings appeared to him to be of a character which rendered it very undesirable that the Government of this country should approve and virtually adopt them by an act of official recognition, such as that now pressed upon them by his friends. No doubt Mr. Sturge, like many others, had followed the early career of Mr. Brooke in the

Malayan Archipelago with no little interest; for it was understood that he was a professed philanthropist, whose object was not to advance the ends of personal interest or ambition, but to extend commerce, civilisation, and Christianity in those remote regions. But in process of time rumours reached this country that he was adopting what appeared to some persons very singular means for promoting such objects. First came an account of a frightful slaughter of the Dyaks, not because they had made any attack upon the settlement at Sarawak, but on the vague general charge of their being pirates. Then there came revelations tending to show that the mode by which Rajah Brooke had got possession of the province over which he claimed sovereignty was, to say the least, of a very questionable sort. Still later, indeed within two years of the time when the application of which we have spoken was being made to the Chambers of Commerce, there had been another terrible slaughter at Sarawak, though it had been previously represented as being in a state of perfect peace and contentment under the rule of its European Rajah. It was upon certain Chinese settlers in the province that destruction fell this time. What the nature of the quarrel was has never been made very clear; but there was no obscurity as to the extent and severity of the vengeance taken. These were the words of Sir James Brooke himself:—‘Out of a population of 4,000 or 5,000, certainly not more than 2,000 have escaped; one-half of this number being composed of women and children.’ Now, all this revolted Mr. Sturge’s principles and feelings alike. He was one of those who did not believe in promoting philanthropy by fire and blood, or in reclaiming savages by adopting and exaggerating their own savage practices. Neither

CHAPTER XXVIII.

CHARITY AT HOME—CONTINUED.

Friends' Sunday Schools—Mr. Sturge's Agency in establishing them—Formation of 'Friends' First Day School Association'—Great Extension of the Birmingham School—Its happy Results—Mr. Sturge entertains the Teachers every Sunday—His wise Counsel and Encouragement—The Effect of the News of his Death on the Pupils—Unsectarian Spirit—Juvenile Crime—Mr. Sturge's Interest in the Subject—Brings Mr. John Ellis from London to make an Experiment—Its Success—Buys an Estate at Stoke for a Juvenile Reformatory—Correspondence with Sir John Pakington—Success of the Reformatory.

BUT there was one species of educational movement at Birmingham in which he bore so prominent a part, and which has been attended with such remarkable results, that we must explain it at some length, borrowing our materials chiefly from a communication supplied to us by Mr. William White, himself one of the instruments in the beneficent work he so well describes.

Although the Society of Friends have always been zealous promoters of secular education, it is only of late years, with few exceptions, that their attention has been drawn to the work of religious instruction in connection with Sabbath schools. 'The late Joseph Sturge,' says the author of the interesting volume called 'All Round the Wrekin,' 'did many a good work in his day, watching always for occasions of generous beneficence, and succouring with that kindness of heart which, so to speak, animates succour with a living spirit. In the year 1845 he was talking with a few young friends on

the deplorable scenes observable in large towns on Sunday mornings ; unwashed Laziness lounging in narrow streets, troops of boys making mischief with trees, hedgerows, and fences, or playing at 'pitch and hustle,' in the outskirts, and expressed a regret that Sunday schools commonly turned their scholars adrift at the ripest age for folly and vice. Could not something be done to mitigate the evil ? The question was not asked in vain ; the young Friends present were willing to try. Thus began the 'Adult Sabbath School' of Birmingham, conducted by the younger members of the Society of Friends. Many objections were started at first by good men : as what *new* scheme of beneficence is ever begun without having to encounter objections from good men ? But it has outlived all objections, and, from small beginnings, now numbers *upwards of one thousand scholars*, while the example given at Birmingham has spread widely among the Society in all parts of the country. Of the part which Mr. Sturge took in promoting this blessed work we must now permit the writer to speak in his own language. Nor can we persuade ourselves to abridge this most interesting and affecting narrative :—

'He was mainly instrumental,' says Mr. White, 'in the establishment of the large Adult Sabbath School at Birmingham. It was at his house that the first teachers' meetings were held, and the plans of usefulness laid, which have since been so eminently successful, and so greatly favoured with the Divine blessing. At the close of the year 1847, when the Birmingham School had been two years in operation, at the invitation of Joseph Sturge, a conference was convened in that town, for the purpose of interesting the Religious Society to which he belonged more largely in the Sabbath School work. A number of Friends were thus brought together from various parts of the kingdom, the result being

the establishment of the "Friends' First Day School Association," which has continued in successful operation ever since; chiefly by the instrumentality of members of the Society in Bristol, the Sabbath School work is now pretty nearly as widely extended amongst Friends as amongst other Christian bodies; and in *Adult* Sabbath Schools especially, they have been remarkably successful.

'It may be fairly said that no institution ever interested Joseph Sturge more completely than the Friends' "First Day School" at Birmingham. For a long time it was quite unique in some of its arrangements. The scholars meet the teachers on First day mornings at the early hour of half-past seven; and it is a cheering sight to see some hundreds of the working classes of both sexes assembling at such an hour for religious instruction.

'Joseph Sturge was preeminently the nursing father of this institution, in which many who were once drunken, ignorant, and depraved, have become sober and consistent Christian men and women. Habits of saving have been encouraged, which have greatly conduced to domestic comfort amongst a class too little in the enjoyment of it; and self-respect and kindred virtues in many a Birmingham workman's home, have taken the place of roughness and profanity. In assembling the school at such an early hour a difficulty arose; many of the young friends engaged as teachers were assistants or apprentices, and it was not easy for them to disturb the arrangements of the householders in which they resided, so as to obtain breakfast before school, and as the Friends' meeting commenced at ten, there was not sufficient time to get a meal at the conclusion of the school at half-past nine. Joseph Sturge, ever fertile in resources, and always "given to hospitality," soon got rid of the difficulty by offering to provide a breakfast for the teachers near the school premises, and this provision is still generously continued since his decease, by other members of his family. And while thus liberally providing for the material wants of the teachers, about every other First day, he himself was present at these seven o'clock breakfasts, always setting the example of punctuality, always

with a beaming smile of welcome for all; and especially a kindly word of encouragement and recognition to the youngest. On these occasions he commonly accompanied the teachers to the school-room, and commenced the business of the school by reading a chapter from the Bible.

‘In the teachers’ meetings he took a deep and lively interest, and whether held at his own house or not he constantly attended them. How he rejoiced when reports of success were made, and the work appeared to be progressing: how he endeavoured to stimulate those who were less successful as teachers than others, who were labouring under discouragement of any kind! In speaking of the duty devolving upon all who had themselves enjoyed the privileges of a religious education, of endeavouring to employ their talents for the temporal or spiritual good of others, he frequently said, “I believe the very youngest teacher may reasonably take encouragement to hope for the Divine blessing, although his calling at first may only be to teach a few poor children their A B C; and if this is done from love to our Master, the reward will not be withheld, and more may afterwards be committed to his keeping.”

‘Although the calls upon his time were incessant, he was always both ready and willing to attend any meeting of scholars in this school he loved so much. Tea and other social meetings are greatly in vogue with the scholars, in connection with various institutions which have grown out of the school. Joseph Sturge was always glad that such meetings should be made a means of moral and religious improvement, and on the invitation of a teacher or some of the scholars, he would spend a whole evening in listening to the experiences of many of the men from amongst those in whose character a change had taken place. On one occasion he had hastened from London, where in the morning he had formed part of a deputation to Lord Palmerston, on purpose to be present at one of these friendly gatherings, in which he remarked how much more congenial to his own feelings the conclusion of the day was, than the commencement.

‘He highly appreciated the growing independence and

self-helpfulness of many of the scholars; regarding it as no small evidence of the benefit they had received in the school.

'Some of these scholars, from having derived good themselves, became desirous of doing good to others. In one case in particular, a young man seeing a number of poor ignorant children running about the streets on the Sabbath, and apparently uncared for, invited some of them into his own house, and in a simple way began to give them instruction, expending a little from his scanty means in buying two or three large-print Testaments and some elementary books. This little effort was successful; the number of children increased to such an extent that the cottage became too small, on which the worthy man obtained permission to use a dilapidated warehouse near at hand. After this little school had continued in operation for twelve months, the teacher, being at one of those tea meetings at which Joseph Sturge was also present, gave a little account of his labours. At the conclusion of the meeting he called the young man aside, and slipped two sovereigns into his hand, saying, "I am no teacher, but I can give a little money; I hope thou wilt be encouraged to persevere, and any time that a little help is needed, I shall be obliged if thou wilt let me know of it."

'The writer will never forget the last visit Joseph Sturge paid to Severn Street school only the Sabbath preceding his death. He was accompanied by a minister of the Society of Friends from a distant town, but who was engaged in religious service in Birmingham at that time. Joseph Sturge introduced his friend to the scholars as "one who had come in the love of the Gospel to visit his friends at Birmingham; and who, with similar feelings, had come to the school that morning, and who would probably have something to say to them after the usual chapter had been read." A very appropriate address followed, at the conclusion of which a solemn silence ensued, and which continued for a longer period than was customary on such occasions, teachers and scholars being apparently deeply impressed. Joseph Sturge remarked afterwards to a teacher on his way to meeting, that he could

hardly tell how it was that the silence held so long, but that he did not seem able to break it any sooner.

‘On the following First day it devolved on the writer to read a chapter from the same desk where Joseph Sturge had so often, with loving accents and genial smile, read the Holy Book—during the week *he* had gone to his rest. His favourite chapter, Romans xii., was chosen, and a few remarks offered in connection with the sad loss teachers and scholars alike had sustained in the removal of one so “fruitful in good works,” and in kindly counsel towards the institution he had done so much to rear and to support in efficient working. The tearful and subdued expression of countenance on the part of the scholars evinced how deeply they felt *their* loss, and many, many expressions of sorrow and regret fell from their lips that day. Such as these: “Ah, if ever there was a good man he was one!” “I shall never read or hear that chapter without thinking of Mr. Sturge!” “Well, we are sure if the Bible is true that *he* is safe!” “Birmingham and Severn Street Sabbath Schools will seem quite different places without Mr. Sturge!” “Mr. Sturge wasn’t a bit proud—he used to make himself just one of *us*!” “Yes, and if anybody called at his house to ask for a little help for a scholar or a poor neighbour, he was just as kind as though we *was* his equals, and actually thanked us for asking him!” And then the tears would flow as another would say, “Ah, we shall never see his like *no more*!”’

But it was in no sectarian spirit that Mr. Sturge promoted this Friends’ Sunday-school. It did, indeed, afford him singular pleasure to see the young people connected with his own denomination engage in a work which promised such admirable results; for he had long felt that in latter times too much of the spirit of Quietism had crept over a society which, in its earlier years, was remarkable for nothing more than the actively aggressive and missionary character of its labours. But he by no means restricted his interest and

encouragement to that school. In a resolution of the Birmingham Sunday-school Union adopted after his death, that body, while speaking of his universal world-wide benevolence, 'desires specially to have in remembrance the kindly sympathy and cooperation received from him for many years by this Union, by contributions to its schemes of usefulness, by presiding at some of its meetings, and by adding to all the weight of his own example in varied efforts to benefit the rising race.'

Nothing, indeed, can more strikingly show the largeness of his heart and the catholicity of his temper than the character of these tributes to his memory which flowed in upon the family from individuals and from bodies belonging to every class and sect without distinction.

No class of his fellow-men was excluded from the sympathies of Joseph Sturge. We have now to speak of what he did for the lowest class of all—the poor children who through orphanage or neglect had become the sweepings of the streets and gaols.

It was in the year 1851 that Joseph Sturge's attention was specially called to the subject of juvenile crime. A conference had been called in Birmingham to consider this question, before which many affecting details were laid, showing the extent of the evil and the means that had been taken elsewhere for its removal or mitigation. He was deeply touched with pity for the desolate condition of the wretched children whose story was there told—first abandoned to neglect which tempted them to crime, and then sent to prisons, where often, instead of being reformed, their criminal education was completed by contact with others worse than themselves. With characteristic decision he determined to make an effort to rescue some of these unfortunates. The name

of Mr. John Ellis had been often mentioned at the conference as having been actively and successfully engaged for ten years as teacher in a ragged school in London, and as employing convicted thieves in his trade as a shoemaker. Mr. Sturge immediately communicated with him and induced him to come down to Birmingham to superintend an experiment he was resolved to begin for the reformation of juvenile criminals. He took a house in Ryland Road, Edgbaston, fitted it up, and then went to Mr. Stephens, the superintendent of police, and said, 'Now, I want some of the very worst boys you have in Birmingham.' Both that gentleman and the governor of the gaol cheerfully cooperated with him. Sixteen of the most notorious offenders were chosen. Twelve months afterwards Mr. Adderley, who had taken the liveliest interest in the experiment, said at a meeting at Dee's Hotel—'Few weeks have passed without my visiting the school, and I may be supposed therefore to be capable of forming an opinion on the subject; and I have no hesitation in pronouncing it to have been most successful. Mr. Ellis had not a single failure from the time he commenced, although he had had under his care leaders of gangs of thieves—regular "gaol-birds"—whom the police almost resented being taken out of their hands.'

Encouraged by this auspicious commencement, Mr. Sturge next bought an estate at Stoke Prior, near Bromsgrove, in Worcestershire, about sixteen miles from Birmingham, which he devoted entirely to the work of juvenile reformation. There was a roomy farm-house with out-houses already in existence in the centre of the farm, to which he added largely by building school-rooms, dormitories, workshops, baths, &c., until at last accommodation was provided for

about sixty boys. There is a home provided for these poor outcasts, where they are not only well clothed and fed, but carefully educated, and trained to habits of industry by being taught trades or skilled agricultural labour. Above all, it was his desire that the institution should be pervaded by an atmosphere of Christian love, that these neglected children might, if possible, be won to Him who was not ashamed to be known as 'the friend of sinners.' All means are employed to encourage the boys to diligence and thrift, a certain portion of what they earn being laid aside as a small reserve fund, which is given to them when they depart from the institution. When their time has expired suitable situations are sought for them, and if they lose those situations and are again cast upon the world, they are still to look upon the Reformatory as their home, to which they can return for a while, until some other means are found for them of earning an honest living.

Mr. Sturge's intention was to continue the institution on the principle on which he had started it, of collecting, by information from the police, the worst specimens among the criminal class of children, and taking the management and responsibility upon himself, in conjunction with his brother Charles. And for this they had made ample provision.

But in course of time Mr. Perry, the Inspector of Prisons, Sir John Pakington, Lord Lyttelton, and other gentlemen connected with Worcestershire, who were deliberating as to the establishment of a County Reformatory School for young criminals, applied to him to enquire if it were possible to make some arrangement with him for the reception of the criminal boys of the county at his institution. They met him at Stoke to

confer on this point. Mr. Sturge, however, felt very reluctant to do anything which should have the effect of transforming what was the offspring of pure Christian compassion into a Government establishment, which might ultimately come under the control of a mere formal officialism. On the question of religion he was especially jealous. In selecting a superintendent for the Reformatory, he had been above all things anxious to secure a man of earnest Christian character. And having done so, his wish was, in order to encourage the *home-feeling* he desired to cultivate among the inmates, that he should be regarded as a sort of father by the boys, and nothing be done which might interfere with his influence. But, on the other hand, the gentlemen referred to thought that if by the acceptance of their proposal the institution was to assume something of a *county* character, 'some clergyman of the Church of England should,' in the words of Sir John Pakington, 'from time to time visit and instruct in religion those boys who are members of that church, or not members of any other denomination.' On this point the negotiation was broken off. But it was conducted on both sides in so admirable a spirit that we cannot resist the temptation of inserting here a part of the correspondence between Mr. Sturge and Sir John Pakington.

Mr. Sturge conveyed his decision in the following letter :—

'TO SIR JOHN PAKINGTON, M.P., &c. &c.

'In accordance with my engagement, after the conversation with thyself, Lord Lyttelton, and the other gentlemen I had the pleasure of meeting at Stoke on the 13th inst., that I would state in writing if we could take any number of the youthful offenders that the magistrates of Worcestershire might wish to send, and if so, under what arrangements—

'I beg leave to say that on reconsidering the subject with an anxious desire to second your benevolent object my opinion is confirmed that we cannot, without endangering the whole success of an experiment to which we attach great importance, concede the right of interference even in religious teaching. If our superintendent is qualified for his office, we wish all the boys to regard him with the confidence, respect, and affection they would a kind and wise parent, and to have that reliance upon him in regard to their spiritual instruction to which such a parent is entitled.

'We have requested the inspector of prisons to send to us, as far as he can suitably select them, those who are orphans, or have no friends. Our object is to lead these poor outcasts (who are often more entitled to pity than condemnation) from vicious to virtuous habits, from idleness to industry, and above all, we should rejoice in their becoming true Christians. This we think most likely to be effected, under the Divine blessing, by the reading and inculcation of the doctrines of the New Testament without any sectarian bias, and by the circumspect conduct of those under whose care they are placed. If through a Saviour's love they should become members of His Church, we consider it of little importance to which section of it they may attach themselves when of an age to judge for themselves. In these views my brother and our superintendent unite, but we hardly expect they will be satisfactory to a majority of the magistrates of the County of Worcester. If, however, they should wish us to take some of the objects of their care without any interference with our management, we will endeavour to arrange to accommodate not exceeding ten the next six months.

'Thine sincerely and respectfully,

'JOS. STURGE.

'Birmingham: 11th Month, 15, 1855.'

'Westwood Park: November 18, 1855.

'MY DEAR SIR,—At a meeting yesterday of the gentlemen desirous of establishing a Reformatory Institution for young criminals in this county, at which I had the honour of

presiding, I stated the substance of what passed between you and the sub-committee who met you at Stoke on Tuesday last, and I also read the letter of the 15th inst. with which you have since favoured me.

‘I greatly hoped that a permanent arrangement might have been made for the reception of the criminal boys of this county at your institution, and as you said yourself, there was no difference of principle between you and the sub-committee to prevent it; but as, on subsequent reflection, you are disinclined to concede as a right or rule that which I have since heard Mr. Hancock himself at one time invited—viz. that some clergyman of the Church of England should from time to time visit and instruct in religion those boys who are members of that church, or not members of any new denomination—the gentlemen who met yesterday feel precluded from entering into any agreement of a permanent character.

‘As some time, however, must elapse before any new arrangement for the benefit of the county in this respect can be completed, I shall recommend my brother magistrates in Quarter Sessions, or wherever else I may be acting with them, for the present to commit boys under the new law to your reformatory at Stoke.

‘The gentlemen assembled yesterday concurred in this course, and I hope you will not object to it; if so, probably some communication with Mr. Perry may be necessary, which may be made either by you or by me, as you may prefer. What number we may wish to send it is not in my power to tell you.

‘I must beg your permission to state before I conclude this letter how greatly and sincerely I respect the purity of motive and the truly Christian benevolence and charity which distinguished the whole of your communications to the sub-committee last Tuesday, and I have reason to believe that the gentlemen with me are equally impressed with these feelings.

‘I hope and pray that you may live to see your generous efforts crowned with success, and I have the honour to remain, dear Sir, very faithfully and truly yours,

‘JOHN S. PAKINGTON.

‘Joseph Sturge, Esq.’

By degrees, however, the temporary arrangement suggested by Sir John Pakington in the above letter glided into a permanent one. The magistrates not only of Worcestershire, but of many other counties throughout England, commit boys that are brought before them to the reformatory at Stoke. The inmates are taken both to church and chapel on Sunday, while the domestic religious instruction is entrusted to the excellent superintendent, Mr. Hancock.

We shall have a very imperfect conception of the part which Mr. Sturge took in the establishment of this institution, if we imagine that it consisted only in a generous devotion of his money to the reclamation of these unfortunate boys. His whole heart was in the undertaking. Busy as his life was, he visited Stoke constantly, and would sometimes sleep on the premises, that he might have an opportunity of coming more closely into personal contact with the children. He would talk to them separately, enquire into each one's history, and by words of gentle warning and encouragement would seek to woo them from their aberrations into the paths of virtue and religion. He planned treats and railway excursions for them, on which he would accompany them himself. He would get his friends to visit them, and address to them words of kindly counsel and sympathy. In short, we believe we shall not be profaning the beautiful words spoken of his Divine Master if we apply them to him, and say that his object was to seek and to save those that were lost. Nor was he left without a rich recompence. Eighty per cent. of these poor outcasts, who but for his intervention might have ended a life of crime in the hulks or on the scaffold, become honest, useful members of society.

But there is another, and by far the most numerous class of Mr. Sturge's benefactions, of which nothing has been and little can be said here. We refer to his constant private charities, performed in a manner so quiet that their course could be traced only by their effects, as that of some noiseless stream is traced by the verdure and fruitfulness which clothe its banks. How many a widow's heart has he made to sing for joy! How many a poor struggler, stricken down in the battle of life, has he lifted up with gentle hand, and equipped afresh for the conflict! How many working-men and others, unable to make way amid the crowding competitions of this Old World, has he aided to emigrate to America and elsewhere, often, moreover, kindly commending them to friends of his own, like-minded with himself, who were thereby ready to take them by the hand on their arrival in their new country. Mr. Tappan's letters often refer to cases of this sort. Upon how many of his fellow-workers, in his various schemes of philanthropy, who were less favoured than himself in their worldly circumstances, has his bounty fallen as copiously and refreshingly, and also as gently, as the dew! How many a broken-down labourer in the field of Christian usefulness has been sustained by his sympathy and succoured by his generosity! Many instances of this nature have come to the knowledge of the biographer, while examining his letters and papers, but many more doubtless are known only to the grateful hearts who tasted his delicate kindness. A friend has furnished us with two examples which came quite incidentally to his knowledge, and which, as he truly observes, 'lie away from the beaten path of benevolence.'

' Within the circle of his friends was a decayed gentleman of a noble character, whose loss of fortune had seemed rather to increase his usefulness and activity in the service of the public. As age advanced, the *res angustæ* compelled some of the cherished members of his family to remove to Canada. Joseph Sturge called shortly before their departure, and with that simplicity and tenderness so peculiarly his own, placed a 50*l.* note in his friend's hand, with the simple remark, he "had been thinking it might be useful." The fact would never have been known if the old man had not himself spoken of it, and confessed with tears in his eyes that the gift was "most seasonable."

' A worthy tradesman whom Joseph Sturge greatly esteemed became ill of a chronic and painful malady. This was not a case of destitution such as would call forth ordinary sympathy and help, but Joseph Sturge's power of sympathy and thoughtfulness for others were more than ordinary. He pondered the case of his friend, saw that the appropriate remedial means were beyond the resources of the patient, and came to the conclusion that he must go, at his expense, to a hydropathic establishment at a distance. After months of treatment the patient returned in comparatively comfortable health, at a cost to his benefactor of sixty pounds.'

CHAPTER XXIX.

LAST SERVICE—DEATH AND FUNERAL.

Elected President of Peace Society in 1858—His Remarks on that Occasion—Anxiety to enlist the Young in the Cause of Peace—Visits the North with Mr. Smith and Mr. Richard—His touching Addresses during that Journey—Letter to Mr. Alexander—Attends Meeting of Voluntary School Association—Intended to take the Chair at Anniversary of the Peace Society—Retires to Rest in his usual Health on the 13th of May—Prayer at his Son's Bed-side—Rises at Six on the 14th—Attacked by a distressing Cough, and suddenly expires—The Funeral—Meeting for the Erection of a Memorial—Rev. J. A. James's Speech—The Inauguration of the Memorial—Mr. Bright's Speech.

BUT the end was now at hand. This long series of services in the cause of humanity was drawing to a close. The brave and generous heart that had beaten so loyally to the interests of righteousness and mercy on the earth was about to be stilled. But it happened to him as he could have wished—his life and his labours ended together. The Great Master had not assigned to him what often proves the most difficult of all forms of service, and might have been especially so to one of his ardent and active nature, that of those 'who only stand and wait.' He passed without even an interval of rest from his work to his reward. The end also was in beautiful harmony with his life and character. The last service in which he was engaged was in connection with that cause which was so dear to his heart, for which he had long 'both laboured and suffered

reproach,' the cause of peace on earth and good-will among men. In the year 1858, on the death of Mr. Charles Hindley, he was elected president of the Peace Society, and never was there an appointment the fitness of which was more instantly and unanimously recognised. In the report of what took place on that occasion, we are told that when the resolution of the meeting of members was passed and presented to him, 'Mr. Sturge, with considerable emotion, stated that it was from no affectation of humility, but from a sincere sense of his own incompetency, he must express his wish that the committee had selected some other person for this office. He thought especially, that it would have been better to have appointed some one who was not a member of the Society of Friends; but if his friends thought otherwise, he was willing to submit himself to their judgment. He was conscious of some failure in his own strength, and had been desirous to withdraw from public engagements. But certainly there was no cause to which he should better like to devote whatever of ability and energy remained to him, than to the cause of peace.'

It was obvious to those in close intercourse with him, that abundant as had been his labours in this cause for so many years, he felt that the new position in which he was placed entailed upon him additional obligations which he was prepared to take up with characteristic decision and thoroughness. And the direction which his activity took was significant and affecting. 'Joseph Sturge,' says Mr. Pumphrey, 'had for some time felt his strength failing, he was sensible that his sun was nearing the horizon, and that the shadows of evening were gathering around him. He looked on the vast field in which he had so long and earnestly laboured,

and saw that a goodly harvest was ripening for the garner, but where were the labourers? Not a few of his early associates had gone before him to their heavenly rest. Could he devote his remaining energies to better purpose than in the recruiting service? Himself about to lay aside his armour, could he more efficiently serve the cause, than by endeavouring to enlist his younger brethren in this bloodless warfare, and engage their sympathies and zeal for peace?'

His mind had, indeed, been much occupied for some time with the wish to press the claims of this question upon the young, especially among the members of his own Society. In pursuance of this object, in March 1859, he accompanied Mr. Edward Smith of Sheffield and the biographer to a series of meetings in the north of England, visiting Leeds, Ackworth, Wakefield, Rawden School, Bradford, York, Darlington, and Newcastle. He had then evidently some premonition of his approaching decease, for in pleading with his young friends present at those meetings, which he did with inexpressible earnestness and pathos, he signified his belief, on every occasion on which he spoke, that he was addressing them for the last time, and assured them that in the near prospect of his own departure, there was no remembrance of his life upon which he dwelt with more satisfaction, than on any humble services he had been permitted to render the cause of peace. Writing to Mr. G. W. Alexander on April 2, 1859, he refers to this journey. After speaking to his friend, who was at that time much interested in the cause of education, of two subscriptions, of 50*l.* and 30*l.* each, which he was willing to contribute towards that object in England and Jamaica, he adds:—'But the Temperance, Anti-slavery, and Peace cause I feel to have a

paramount claim upon me, especially the two latter, which have lost the support of some who used to be their most liberal helpers. Though from some affection of the heart I have very much lost the power of walking, except slowly and for a short distance, yet I had satisfaction lately in accompanying Edward Smith and Henry Richard on a little peace tour as far as Newcastle, to try to induce younger people to come forward in the cause, before all the older ones have died, and though many among the wealthy and their children stood aloof, yet we were encouraged by the number who were willing to come forward and help, whose pecuniary means were more limited.'

The biographer saw him but once after that journey. Being then Honorary Secretary of the Voluntary School Association, he had pressed Mr. Sturge to attend its annual meeting in London about the middle of May. With his wonted readiness to oblige and encourage, he kindly consented. The meeting was held at the Milton Club in Ludgate Hill. In a few simple words he expressed his unabated attachment to the cause of education, and ended by promising a subscription of 100*l.* for the year to the Society. At the close of the meeting he said to the writer, 'I want to speak to thee.' 'I will walk with you to your lodgings,' was the reply. 'I am afraid,' he answered, 'I must trouble thee to get me a cab, I can't walk owing to shortness of breath.' This remark struck with rather a chill on the heart of the hearer. The cab was accordingly procured, and we drove to his lodging near Finsbury Circus. He then spoke with great anxiety and feeling of a dear friend who was in considerable trouble, and of what he was doing to help him. These were the last words the writer ever heard from his lips, words of kindly

sympathy and meditated succour for others. To the last, 'on his tongue was the law of kindness.'

At this interview he had intimated his full expectation of being present at the annual meeting of the Peace Society on the 17th of May. All the arrangements had been made accordingly. His name was announced as chairman of the meeting in the advertisements and placards. But it had been ordained otherwise. Brief as the interval that had yet to elapse, before it had expired, he had been called into the region of perfect and eternal peace, where the wicked cease from troubling and the weary are at rest. On Friday the 13th of May he appeared quite as well as, if not better than, usual. After his little boy had retired to rest, he went, as was his frequent practice, to his chamber, and gave him counsel on various subjects to which he wished to turn his attention during his own absence in London. Before he left the room he prayed fervently beside the bed of his beloved child, closing with the petition for his family, that 'in heaven not one of them might be missing. On the morning of the 14th he had risen at his usual early hour, about six o'clock. He was soon attacked by a distressing fit of coughing, which, however, did not prevent his retiring, as was his wont, to an adjoining closet for the devotional reading of the Scriptures and prayer. He then called one of his little girls to prepare to join him in their customary ride on horseback before breakfast. But on returning to his room, with the cough unabated, he sat down on the foot of the bed and said to his wife, 'I am very ill.' The servants were called, and such remedies as were at hand were tried for his relief, but in vain. On the window being opened for air he knelt before it for some minutes, and in a few broken sentences offered up short ejaculatory

prayers. For a short time his bodily sufferings were severe, and he soon became unable to speak. He was lifted on to the bed, and the pain subsided into the faintness of death. His brothers, in the meanwhile, had been sent for. They came hastily, and soon after their arrival saw the form, indeed, and the face they loved so well, stretched on the couch before them, the passing spasm of agony having already given place to an expression of perfect, of 'heavenly serenity,' as the bystanders described it. 'But HE *was* not, for God took him.' The faithful servant had finished the work that had been given him to do. He was still standing with his loins girt and his lamp trimmed ready for further service if required. But on that early May morning, soon after the break of day, he had heard his Master's voice, saying 'Come up hither!' and he was gone. It was not so much death as a translation.

'He set, as sets the morning star, which goes
Not down behind the darkened west, nor sinks
Obscured amid the tempests of the sky,
But melts away into the light of heaven.'

The news, which soon spread through the town, that 'Joseph Sturge was dead,' sounded like a knell over Birmingham that day, and saddened all hearts. High and low, rich and poor, men of all religious denominations and of every shade of political opinion, joined in lamentation over the loss which the community had sustained by the removal of one so universally honoured and beloved.

The interment took place on May 20. 'The Corporation of Birmingham,' says Mr. James, in his funeral sermon for his friend, 'had their offer been accepted, would have awarded to him a public funeral; and though the accustomed retiringness of his denomination

declined this mark of respect, it could not repress the spontaneous expressions of general esteem. The lengthened cortége—the closed shops—the crowded streets—the long procession of respectable men—the mixture of ministers and members of religion of all denominations—the seriousness or sorrow that sat on every countenance, which in mournful silence seemed to say, ‘We have lost a benefactor’—the numerous sermons which from the pulpits of various denominations paid a tribute to his memory—all proclaimed the respect in which he was held, and which was in fact a public honour put not only upon the benefactor but upon philanthropy itself.’

We cannot better describe the scene on the day of the funeral than in the words of the leading journal of the town (the ‘Birmingham Daily Post’), the most touching part of which was the way in which the working-people stood in crowds amid the pouring rain along the whole line of the procession, many with tears in their eyes, and all with deep sadness in their countenances:—

‘The funeral of Mr. Sturge took place yesterday, and the scene was one which has certainly never been paralleled in Birmingham. It seems to be with the deceased philanthropist as with many in a more humble sphere. His value to the community is only fully appreciated when he is lost to it; for though honoured while he lived, few believed that his death could have evoked so profound an expression of sorrow, and such general tokens of reverence for his memory.

‘The mournful cortége formed in Wheeley’s Road about ten o’clock. It then consisted of a very plain hearse and upwards of thirty carriages, but as the procession moved towards the town it was joined by nearly as many more. At the corner of Frederick Street some 300 gentlemen, who had met at the Edgbaston Vestry Hall, formed in line, and walked in front, three abreast. They were headed by the Mayor, Sir

John Ratcliff, and the Rev. Dr. Miller, Rector of St. Martin's; and every class and body in the town was well represented. Justices of the peace, aldermen, councillors, clergy, dissenting ministers, &c., were all there to testify the universal esteem in which Mr. Sturge was held. There were also deputations from some of the bodies in which the deceased took a special interest, including the Anti-Slavery Committee, the Peace Committee, the Temperance Committee, the Band of Hope Union Committee (including representatives from nearly every band), the Alliance Committee, the Baptist Missionary Committee, the teachers of Severn Street Schools, &c. In the mourning coach immediately following the hearse were Mrs. Sturge and her young family, with Mr. Thomas Sturge, of Gloucester, the deceased's eldest brother; and in succeeding carriages were Mr. and Mrs. Charles Sturge, Mr. John Cropper, of Liverpool, Mr. and Mrs. Edmund Sturge, Mr. and Mrs. James Cadbury, of Banbury, Mr. Lewis J. Sturge, of the University of Cambridge, and numerous younger members of the various branches of the family. The other occupants of the long train of carriages included Mr. John Bright, M.P., Mr. Henry Pease, M.P., Mr. C. Gilpin, M.P., Mr. John Pease (Darlington), Mr. John Ellis (Leicester), Mr. Samuel Fox (Nottingham), Mr. Robert Foster (London), Mr. Henry Dickinson (Coalbrookdale), Mr. Samuel Bowly (Gloucester), Mr. T. F. Addison (Gloucester), Mr. Stanley Pumphrey (Worcester), Mr. Thomas Harvey (Leeds), Mr. G. W. Alexander (London), Mr. Henry Vincent (London), Mr. Henry Sterry (London), Rev. Henry Richard (London), Mr. Cyrus Clark (Street, Glastonbury), Mr. Henry Ashworth (Bolton), Mr. Henry Smithies (of the 'British Workman'), Mr. Thomas Pumphrey (Friends' School, Ackworth), Mr. L. A. Chamerovzow (Secretary British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society), Mr. Isaac Sharp (Middlesbrough), Mr. J. B. Braithwaite (of London, barrister-at-law), and all the leading members of the Society of Friends in Birmingham and other towns. Amongst the local gentlemen we observed the Rev. John Angell James, the Rev. George Pettitt, the Rev. C. Vince, the Rev. J. J. Brown, the Rev. J. T. Burt, the Rev. T.

H. Morgan, the Rev. R. W. Dale, the Rev. E. Derrington, the Rev. J. Wilson, the Rev. John Hammond, the Rev. A. O'Neill, the Rev. W. Bevan (Wolverhampton), the Rev. J. Ponting (Potteries); William Middlemore, Esq., W. Mathews, Esq., Dr. Melson, Aldermen Lloyd, Manton, Hodgson, Hawkes, Baldwin, Palmer, Cutler, and Gameson; Mr. A. Ryland, Mr. George Edmonds, Mr. William Morgan, Dr. Fleming, &c.

‘Though heavy showers of rain fell almost without intermission, yet the two miles of street traversed by the funeral train were lined on either side by patient crowds of people, the countenances of hundreds of whom showed that they had nearly as keen a sense of the loss sustained as if they had been Mr. Sturge’s intimate friends. The sight was really a touching one, and must have raised in many a mind the question whether we have in Birmingham another man who could have evoked such a demonstration of sympathy and respect. Nearly all the tradesmen in Islington, Broad Street, Paradise Street, New Street, and Bull Street, put up their shutters, and suspended business while the cortége passed. It was nearly eleven o’clock ere the meeting-house in Bull Street was reached, though order on the route was admirably maintained by Chief Superintendent Stephens and a large body of police. Burials in the small grave-yard adjoining the meeting-house are confined, we believe, to the brick vaults now existing, and to the one belonging to the Sturge family the coffin was borne on its removal from the hearse. Mrs. Sturge, her son and daughters, and all the immediate male and female relatives, followed, and stood round the grave, amid a large assemblage of sympathising fellow-mourners, while a brief and appropriate prayer was offered by Mr. Sharp, of Middlesborough. This done, the coffin was slowly lowered into the vault, and nearly all present retired into the meeting-house, the galleries and spacious area of which were completely filled.’

A brief extract from the letter of a friend to whose communications this volume has been largely indebted, and which was written at the time, will give the reader

some impression of the religious service at the meeting-house, which closed the public solemnities of the day:—

‘Most of the leading gentlemen of the town were present, the mayor, Dr. Miller (the rector), J. Angell James, &c. Very soon J. B. Braithwaite stood up and spoke briefly but beautifully on the humility which characterised our beloved friend. Though so abundant in works of charity and beneficence, he did not in the least trust in them, but placed his sole dependence for salvation on His Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, whom he entirely and fervently loved. John Clark of Street followed. After him Joseph Thorp rose and preached a very impressive and eloquent sermon. Beginning with the solemnity of death, he said it was not a less solemn thing to live. This thought he enlarged upon and illustrated in a very striking manner. He seemed to bring the importance of the eternal state very near his audience, and appealed to them, if any were yet strangers to the hopes and privileges of the Gospel, to accept while yet the opportunity was afforded the free and full salvation offered through Jesus Christ, all of grace, free grace, “not of works lest any man should boast,” and not of works, also, lest any poor creature, conscious of his undeservings and the poverty of his best performances, should utterly despair. In the course of his address he gave brief but full testimony to the character and labours of our departed friend. Thomas Pumphrey followed in his usual impressive manner. After a very solemn time of silence John Pease rose and said that his own spirit had been feeding on the declaration of our blessed Lord, “I am the true vine,” and were it not placed by the Divine Spirit on the page of inspiration that “Herein is my Father glorified, that ye bear much fruit,” it might seem presumption to suppose for a moment that any works of poor weak man could tend to the Divine glory. He expressed his full belief that our beloved friend was a living branch in the vine of life, and that he had brought forth much fruit to the glory of our heavenly Father. John Sharp offered prayer,

closing with the petition, in allusion to the war on the Continent, that it might please our gracious Father to cause the wrath of men to praise Him, and that the remainder of that wrath might be restrained. It would be generally felt, I believe, that it had been a very solemn time. One gentleman, not a Friend, told me he was disappointed so little was said in eulogy of Joseph Sturge, but this I think was quite unnecessary. The gathering itself in all its features was a far more eloquent tribute than any words could have been. His own humble spirit would have rejoiced that so great an opportunity should have been seized, not to exalt the creature, but to endeavour to win souls to Christ.

It was indeed an instructive spectacle which Birmingham presented that day, when the whole town, the seat of the largest manufacture of small fire-arms in the world, bowed in reverence over the bier of Joseph Sturge, the man of peace. It was a tribute paid, not to rank, or station, or learning, or eloquence, for he had none of these, but to virtue alone. It is to the honour of the people of, what Mr. Whittier truly calls 'the city of his love,' that they did not wait until he was dead to find out that a great man and a prophet had been among them. From a very early period they had recognised the rare excellence and worth of the fellow-citizen whom Providence had sent to dwell in their midst. Generally they were the foremost to sustain him in his enterprises of philanthropy and progress; they revered his character and were proud of his fame. Except during the brief madness of the Russian war, they never ceased to follow him with their confidence and affection. And it was surely also a signal testimony to the genuineness of the man, to the transparent integrity of his character that, of all places in the kingdom, he was held in most esteem by those who were the daily witnesses of his life.

Nor were his fellow-citizens willing that his memory should fade from the town which his virtues had helped to render illustrious. On the following August a meeting was held at the Town Hall 'of those favourable to the promotion of a memorial of the late Mr. Joseph Sturge.' The chair was taken by Sir John Ratcliff, the mayor, supported by W. Middlemore, Esq., Aldermen Lloyd, Manton, Hodgson, and Palmer, Revs. G. Pettitt, J. A. James, C. Vince, R. Hall, and A. O'Neil, Messrs. H. Bolton, G. Edmonds, Brooke Smith, J. S. Wright, W. R. Hughes, J. A. Cooper, W. Jeff, &c.

Letters were read from Lord Brougham, Messrs. Cobden, M.P., Bright, M.P., Chance, Green, Sir James Watts, &c., apologising for their inability to attend, and expressing cordial sympathy with the object of the meeting. The following was Mr. Bright's letter:—

'Rochdale: August 19, 1850.

'MY DEAR SIR,—I am sorry that an engagement which I cannot well get rid of will prevent my being with you at the interesting meeting you are to hold on the 24th inst. I am not generally in favour of statues or monuments erected to the memory of the departed; but in the case now before us, I shall gladly support any plan that is likely to aid in keeping before the eye and the mind of the people the noble character and the eminent services of our lamented friend Joseph Sturge. To me his life, so far as I was acquainted with it, was a great lesson. I knew him most intimately in the last years of his life, when there was about him a ripeness of goodness which is rarely seen among men. In looking back to him—in recalling that which was striking in his conversation, his temper, his habits of thought, and his actions, I often say to myself—"What a glorious man he was! what courage and what meekness! what benevolence in action and what charity in thought! what a charming unselfishness, and what a following of that highest example afforded to us in the New

Testament history." I hope if you succeed in raising any memorial of our departed friend, it may serve as a stimulus to all who see it and know its origin, and that it may increase amongst us a feeling of reverence for that true nobleness which was so conspicuous in his character.

'I am, very sincerely yours,

'JOHN BRIGHT.

'Mr. Alderman Manton, Birmingham.'

The Mayor afterwards moved, that this meeting, 'acknowledging the claims of the late Mr. Sturge to the grateful recollection of his fellow-countrymen, cordially approves of the proposal to raise a memorial of his eminent public virtues.' This was seconded by the Rev. J. A. James, in a speech so beautiful that we cannot forbear citing it here:—

'The Rev. J. A. James seconded the proposition, observing that he did so with much pleasure. As one whose happiness it was for many years to enjoy a somewhat intimate acquaintance with the late Mr. Sturge, and as one who highly esteemed and loved him for the many virtues he possessed, he should ever have reproached himself if he had been absent from a meeting convened to do honour to his memory. "Honour to whom honour is due" was one of the injunctions of that sacred volume whose lessons it was his business continually to inculcate, and which he would exemplify in character and conduct as well as enforce by precept from the pulpit, and surely if any man was entitled to honour from those who knew him it was Joseph Sturge. The good man was gone beyond the reach of human praise, and therefore eulogy, however high, could not be charged as flattery, for the dead could not be flattered, nor would eulogy in the smallest degree endanger his humility or excite his vanity. He (Mr. James) believed from the knowledge he had of Mr. Sturge's character and conduct in life, that he had received the "Well done, thou good and faithful servant" from his Divine Saviour, and beyond that testimony of

approbation, could human praise reach him, it would be of little value. Mr. Sturge was a great and good man. His goodness in fact constituted his greatness, and in his (Mr. James's) opinion goodness was the highest scale of greatness. A man's moral nature was above his intellectual, and the intellectual sprang from the moral rather than the moral from the intellectual. Even God himself was greater in glory, from being the God of love, than from being the God of power; and they were most like God, and were the most blessed by Him who displayed that Christian benevolence and goodness, which were the prominent features in the character of Mr. Sturge. He was a Christian, a patriot, and a philanthropist. This was the most that could be said of him, and it was the least that *should* be said of them all. He had a noble mind, but a nobler heart; no man ever lived less for himself and more for the public good than did the friend whose loss they that day deplored. He considered philanthropy his vocation, and he walked worthy of his calling. Of few could it be said with greater propriety that "he went about doing good" like his Master than of Joseph Sturge. He traversed continents and oceans, he sacrificed ease and domestic comfort, and gave not merely his money but still nobler gifts which too few were ready to bestow—his time, his labour, and his influence in the cause of our common humanity. It was an honour to Birmingham that Mr. Sturge lived, laboured, and died in their midst, and it would be a dishonour to Birmingham if its people allowed such a man to depart from amongst them without some emphatic testimony to his excellence, some visible tribute to his memory, which should be an embodiment of their view of his excellence, and also an example for the benefit of others. To him (Mr. James) it was delightful to see men of all parties, politics, and creeds, and all classes of society rising above or sinking their differences in their eagerness to do honour to the memory of Mr. Sturge, all uniting in one harmonious expression of esteem and regard for the character of the man. In contemplating the object of that meeting, he (Mr. James) rose above Mr. Sturge.

He went from the philanthropist to his philanthropy. Why were they to pay respect to the memory of Mr. Sturge? Not because he was a brilliant genius, a profound philosopher, a learned scholar, or a distinguished statesman, but because of his Christian philanthropy. Not that he (Mr. James) did not respect all the other distinctions named, but the virtue he had mentioned had a more intimate connection than any one of them with the well-being of the community. As to the way in which they should express their regard for the memory of Mr. Sturge, he was comparatively indifferent. He should certainly on the whole prefer the erection of a public institution which would be the means of instructing the ignorant, reclaiming the vicious, feeding the hungry, or healing the sick. But he much doubted whether, with all their regard for Mr. Sturge, they should be able to secure means sufficient to carry out such an object. Then came the question of a public statue. What was the meaning of a statue? Not merely a decoration for the town, not merely a tribute of honour to the person who had departed from amongst them; the intention of a statue rose higher than this. It was to commend to public notice, and to hold up for public admiration, the virtues and the excellence of the individual to whom the statue was raised. Therefore it appeared to him that to carry out this object and to effect this purpose, visibility must be given to the memorial whatever it might be. There were statues in Birmingham raised to politicians. He had no objection to this, as in the category of politics must be included law, government, liberty, civilisation, commerce, and everything else that could bless humanity, and he was one to say if men had been eminent in life for promoting their country's welfare in this respect, let them have a statue by all means. Sir Robert Peel was a statesman, and Thomas Attwood led the van of Reform and enlarged what he (Mr. James) considered was the rightful suffrage of Englishmen. Let statues, then, be raised for such men, and let proper respect be paid to their memory; but why should they not in like manner

venerate and perpetuate piety and philanthropy? Howard had his statue in St. Paul's Cathedral, and Wilberforce had his in Westminster Abbey. Was it true, by the way (enquired Mr. James), as had been mentioned to him since he entered the room, that that day was the centenary of the birth of Wilberforce? If so, it was an extraordinary and delightful coincidence. Why should they not have a statue to Joseph Sturge in Birmingham? It was intended to commemorate his virtues. The Holy Scriptures told them "that the wisdom that cometh from above is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, and easy to be entreated, without partiality and without hypocrisy, full of mercy and good fruits." Was not Joseph Sturge an exemplification of that beautiful language of Holy Writ? A statue would be emblematic of the wisdom that cometh from Heaven, that uttereth her voice in the streets, and crieth in the places of chief concourse, and speaketh of piety, temperance, and philanthropy. It would be a kind of open air preacher, which would not fear the envy nor jealousy of publicans, nor summonses from the police, nor the condemnations of the magistrates; but which would proclaim, if, on behalf of a mere man, he (Mr. James) might appropriate the language uttered by our Lord, "I have left you an example that ye should follow my steps." Whatever they might do, let them not rest satisfied with any visible external memorial of their esteemed friend. Let him have a statue in every mind and every heart. Let him be constantly before them as their pattern and example; let them in every case endeavour to imitate where they expressed commendation. Their departed friend had ascended to his eternal repose not indeed in a chariot of fire, but after a death so sudden and so easy as to be almost a translation; but he (Mr. James) would fain hope he had not carried his mantle to heaven, but left it on earth. Blessed and happy would be the man who should seek it and wear it, not only from respect for him who was gone, but for the glory of that God who was the source of all excellence, and its final rewarder in heaven.'

‘The resolution having been adopted unanimously,

‘Mr. Middlemore moved the appointment of a committee, consisting of a number of noblemen and gentlemen, to carry into effect such resolutions as should be agreed upon that day.

‘The Rev. G. Pettitt seconded the motion, observing that he did so with much pleasure, and that he cordially endorsed the feeling and eloquent remarks they had heard from Mr. James.

‘The motion was approved *nem. con.*

‘Mr. George Edmonds said he attended on that occasion at some personal inconvenience, because he felt it to be his duty to show he was not insensible to the character and virtues of Mr. Sturge. He knew him intimately, and had seen him perform acts of benevolence which had only been known to three individuals, and in speaking of him, he felt that he was alluding to one who was infinitely superior to himself in every respect, a perfectly just man, and one who always appeared to have an exalted example in view, and the presence of his Creator ever before him in all he did. After a few further remarks, Mr. Edmonds moved that Lord Brougham be requested to accept the chairmanship of the committee, that Alderman Lloyd be appointed treasurer, and Messrs. J. A. Cooper and W. Jelf secretaries.

‘The meeting was subsequently addressed by Dr. Birt Davies, Alderman Manton, Rev. Mr. Hall, and others.’

Ultimately it was decided that the memorial should be a statue and fountain. It was executed with admirable skill and beauty by Mr. Thomas, the sculptor of London.

It was inaugurated on June 4, 1862, in the presence of a very large assembly gathered around the spot where it was erected. We borrow from the ‘Times’ newspaper the following description of the statue and ceremony:—

‘The statue has been erected on by far the best site in the

town; it is at one of the boundaries where the parishes of Birmingham and Edgbaston meet, the last being the parish in which Mr. Sturge resided. The monument consists of a central figure of Mr. Sturge, his right hand resting on a Bible, and the left extended towards a figure symbolical of Peace. A figure on the other side is typical of Charity. At the base of the statue, in front and back, are large basins for ornamental fountains, and at either side are drinking fountains. The principal figure is in Sicilian marble, the secondary groups in fine freestone. The likeness of the man is portrayed with wonderful fidelity. The expressions of benevolence which spoke so powerfully in life are depicted wonderfully in the stone. The allegorical figures, with their symbols, are also very cleverly executed.

‘There was a large assembly to-day to witness the undraping of the statue. Mr. Bright and Mr. Scholefield, the borough members, were present, as were also the Mayor and many members of the corporation.

‘Mr. Middlemore, the chairman of the Statue Committee, read the following formal address to the Mayor, dedicating the statue to the town:—

“TO HIS WORSHIP THE MAYOR OF THE BOROUGH OF
BIRMINGHAM.

“SIR,—As chairman of the committee I have the duty imposed upon me of making over to you, as representing the Town Council, the statue of the late Mr. Joseph Sturge in trust for the public for ever. The statue has been erected to perpetuate the name and virtues of one who, though possessing none of the advantages of birth and position, and invested with no official dignity, made himself a name among the good men of all lands, by the purity of his life, and by the active and unostentatious exercise of a philanthropy that embraced all the helpless and suffering of our race. Of Mr. Sturge it may emphatically be said that ‘he went about continually doing good.’ Undeterred by ridicule, undaunted by physical difficulties, he endeavoured to avert a disastrous and resultless war. He was a distinguished actor in the

work of negro emancipation, in the reclamation of juvenile offenders, in the cause of education, and in numberless other ways he sought to heal the wounds that sin had made in the framework of society. While Birmingham has her memories of successful warriors and eminent statesmen, it seems right and fitting that the graces of benevolence and philanthropy, as embodied in the character of Mr. Sturge, should be held in honour. With this view the statue of Mr. Sturge, has been erected, and it is now entrusted to your care, in the fervent hope that the example of his beneficent life and this lasting recognition of his virtues may influence generations yet to come.

“Signed on behalf of the Committee,
“WILLIAM MIDDLEMORE, Chairman.

“Birmingham : June 4.”

‘To which the Mayor replied in the following terms:—
“On behalf of the contributors and the family of our departed friend, I thank you, your treasurer, the honorary secretaries, and the committee for the zeal and ability manifested in carrying to so successful a result the responsibility of providing a lasting memorial to departed worth. On behalf of the corporation and the town, I accept the noble gift, with its accompanying obligations. It was my privilege to know Joseph Sturge somewhat intimately. I can therefore with confidence endorse every word of commendation contained in your address. I never knew a man who appeared less selfish and more loving. He was a striking example of how true greatness may be attained, and how much one man might do by a consecrated life to relieve the sufferer and the oppressed. His generous nature knew no distinction between the different sections of God’s great family. It was enough for him to know that help was needed to secure his aid. He was one of God’s epistles to man, and though dead he yet speaketh. I trust that the beautiful memorial this day inaugurated may speak comfort to the bereaved widow and encouragement to the fatherless children, and stimulate many of the present and future generations to follow his example. We should

have been glad to have seen with us this day the genius that designed and almost completed the work of art before us; but, alas! before the finishing stroke was given his arm was paralysed by death, and, instead of receiving the thanks of the multitude now assembled, he speaks to us by this his last work, and from the grave, 'Be ye also ready, for in such an hour as ye think not the Son of Man cometh.'"

Mr. Scholefield and Mr. Bright made appropriate and eloquent speeches on the occasion. The latter gentleman said:—

'I have not been accustomed to look upon statues and monuments to the honour of the living or in memory of the dead with much favour and appreciation. Generally, in this country, and I fear in other countries also, they have been raised rather to rank than to worth, rather to successful ambition than to true goodness, and more often to the destroyers than to the benefactors and saviours of mankind. But to-day there can be no doubt in the mind of any man—to-day we make no mistake—to-day it is worth we honour and not rank; it is true goodness and not successful ambition. We erect this statue to a benefactor and friend, and not to a destroyer of men. I shall not speak a history of our departed friend. I shall not indulge in any elaborate eulogy; but there are certain questions with which his name must be for a length of time—perhaps for ever—associated, to which I should like to advert.'

Mr. Bright then dwelt at some length upon his exertions in the Anti-slavery cause, in the cause of Peace, and on the question of the extension of the suffrage, and then concluded thus:—

'If I were speaking a history of our departed friend I might dwell upon his multitudinous acts of private benevolence. You know more of them than I know; but you and I together know very little of them. But the little only we know because his left hand scarcely knew what his

right **hand** did; but this we have faith to know, that his deeds of **private** benevolence are recorded on those everlasting **tablets** which preserve for ever the memory of the actions of a **good** man. I recollect well the last visit I paid to the house of **Joseph Sturge**. It was but a few days—a very few days—**before** his last day on earth. I went with him to his place of **worship**, and I sat near him. His countenance was in the **line** of my eye, and I observed it more than once. I remarked the gentleness and the purity and the peace that were expressed upon it. I felt that I was looking upon what I may describe as the countenance of “a just man made perfect.” Well, we know all who are connected with the erection of this memorial have raised it to remind us of the character of this man, of his great courage, of his great meekness, of his benevolence in action, of his charity in thought. It is not needful that this statue should be here to remind this generation of him, or, as in the lines—

“Why need we monuments supply
To rescue that can never die?”

But it is raised for succeeding generations, that they may know that such a man dwelt here; that as he lived and as he moved so he was loved—so he was revered; and that in erecting this memorial we do it to stimulate future generations, and inspire them with sentiments of justice; to stimulate them to acts of mercy, and in the hope it may tend to raise up other men, who, in their generation, may confer on this great community an honour and a distinction as great as Birmingham now derives from the life and character of Joseph Sturge.’

CHAPTER XXX.

HIS CHARACTER.

Description of his Person—His Character founded on Religion—The Source of his Strength—Extract from Mr. Whittier—His Habit of early Rising and Meditation—Not ashamed of his Religion—Anecdotes illustrative of this—Sense of the Responsibility of Life—Fear of the Effects of increased Riches—His Liberality increasing with his Means—His Benevolence a matter of Principle—Extract from Mr. James's Funeral Sermon—The spontaneous Character of his Generosity—His Steadfastness—His Loyalty to Principle—His courage—His Energy—His Gentleness and Charity—His humble Estimate of himself—His Failings—Mr. Whittier's Poem on his Death.

IN person Joseph Sturge was somewhat below the middle size, a square and strongly-built figure, capable of great labour and fatigue. In walking he had a kind of swing from side to side, which those who knew him will at once recognise as vividly associated with their image of the man, and which gave an air of good-humoured carelessness to his gait. His hair, originally dark, had become grey, and in some parts nearly white, with advancing age. His complexion was fresh and ruddy. His countenance was singularly expressive of the mingled firmness and gentleness for which his character was distinguished. It was observed by many that he had something of Napoleon's brow and forehead, broad rather than high. His eyebrows were remarkably large and bushy, underneath which, however, there beamed a benignant grey eye that wonderfully softened their austerity. There were times, indeed, when, as his eyes were cast down under those overshadowing eye-

brows, and his lips compressed in the act of writing or other exercise of deep thought, his face assumed an aspect of severity amounting almost to sternness, which revealed to the observer a glimpse of that strength of will which gave so much force to his character. But speak to him, and straightway his eyes, lips, and brow are lighted up with one of the sweetest smiles that ever irradiated a human countenance, and which, when contrasted with his previous mood, might remind one of a sudden burst of sunshine breaking over the face of a mountain tarn.

The foundation of Mr. Sturge's character must be sought in deep and devout religious earnestness. He was not a man to make any display of his religious emotions. But those who were admitted into his intimacy were at no loss to discover whence he derived strength for his long and strenuous labours in the service of mankind. It was because he held habitual communion with the eternal Fountain of life and power, that his own soul was replenished with a divine might which enabled him to stand unmoved amid the flowing and ebbing tide of circumstance and opinion. Mr. Whittier, who accompanied him during his American journey, remarks in a letter now before us, 'The great idea of duty seemed always with him. He used to remind me often of that line of Milton's, which describes his habit of life and labour

"As ever in the great Task-master's eye."

He made no parade of his devotional feelings and duties; he was free from everything like cant or affectation; but I have a most vivid recollection of seasons when the solemnity of silent prayer was upon his countenance as he sought, oftener than the morning, for

strength and wisdom to do in the right way the work which he believed his Divine Master required at his hands.'

It was his habit to rise early, and invariably to devote the first hours of the day to reading of the Scriptures, meditation, and prayer.

'In the retrospect of his life,' says his nearest earthly companion, 'I think no one practice remains more instructively before me than this habit by which he ensured moments of thoughtfulness before the day's press came on; and, considering what the day's press sometimes was to him, we cannot over-estimate the value of this life-long practice of taking the early freshness of each returning portion of the pilgrimage of life for looking to Him who is the source of all grace.' Very beautifully does Dr. Trench compare this to the act of watering a garden 'before the morn is hotly up,' which prevents all its green beauty from being wholly scorched by the sun, 'till evening and the evening dews return.'

'A blessing such as this our hearts might reap,
The freshness of the garden they might share
Through the long day, and heavenly freshness keep
If, knowing how the day and the day's glare
Must beat upon them, we would largely steep
And water them betimes with dews of prayer.'

Thus was he engaged just before the pale messenger found him on the last morning of his life. On the table of the closet to which he had retired, as we have already described, his Bible was found open at the sixth chapter of the Hebrews. So that, probably, the last words on which his eye ever rested were these glorious ones:—
'Wherein God, willing more abundantly to show unto the heirs of promise the immutability of His counsel, confirmed it by an oath: that by two immutable things, in

which it was impossible for God to lie, we might have a strong consolation, who have fled for refuge to lay hold upon the hope set before us; which hope we have as an anchor of the soul, both sure and steadfast, and which entereth into that within the vail; whither the forerunner is for us entered, even Jesus, made an high priest for ever, after the order of Melchisedec.'

It has been said that there was nothing ostentatious in Mr. Sturge's religion. We must, however, add, on the other hand, that he was as far as possible from being ashamed of his religion. The biographer had an opportunity, on more than one occasion, of witnessing rather striking illustrations of this. It was our friend's custom to assemble his family before breakfast to read to them a portion of Scripture, to be followed, after the manner of the Society of Friends, by a solemn pause for silent meditation and prayer. There was nothing in this simple form that could offend anyone's conscience. Nor was it ever omitted, whoever might be present. After the Peace Congress in Paris in 1849, several distinguished French gentlemen came over to England to give the Friends of Peace in this country an opportunity of reciprocating towards them the kind and cordial welcome with which they had been greeted in France. Among these visitors were M. Horace Say, M. Frederic Bastiat, M. Joseph Garnier, and others. They attended large public meetings called to receive them, in London, Birmingham, and Manchester. At Birmingham they were Mr. Sturge's guests. The biographer was there also, and knowing the habit of the household, he remembers wondering a little how their host would act in the presence of these foreign gentlemen. Many would probably have sought some excuse for omitting the customary form of domestic worship on that day.

But it made no difference whatever with Joseph Sturge. At the appointed hour all the members of the family came in, and he sat down quietly in his usual place, and opening the Bible, simply remarked, 'It is our custom to read a chapter from the Bible every morning, which I hope will not be disagreeable to our friends.' It was read accordingly, and was followed by the wonted pause for prayer. We observed that the strangers, far from being offended, were touched almost to tears by the simplicity and solemnity of the act.

On another occasion, when the Association for Social Science met at Birmingham, Mr. Sturge invited many of the leading members of that body, including Lord Brougham, Sir John Pakington, &c., to breakfast at his house. There were between forty and fifty persons present. Again, precisely the same thing occurred. Before beginning the morning meal, Mr. Sturge read to his learned and illustrious guests, with his usual simple earnestness of manner, one of his favourite chapters, 1 Cor. xiii., containing the apostle's memorable eulogy of charity, and then bending his head down, became for a few minutes evidently absorbed in silent prayer.

Joseph Sturge had a very deep sense of the responsibility of life. Life was regarded by him as a stewardship, his time, his talents, his influence, his wealth, as trusts received from above to be used for the honour of God and the good of his fellow-men. Hence the almost trembling apprehension with which he watched the growth of worldly prosperity with himself and his friends, lest the *love* of riches gaining upon them with the *increase* of riches, he and they should fail to make the right use of the gift committed to them by the Master. His letters abound with allusions to this point. 'I wish,' he says in writing to a friend, 'to be thy com-

panion in realising the danger of riches as represented by our Saviour—a danger which, I believe, increases with our years, while at the same time we may become more unconscious of the folly of embracing more closely our wealth as the time we can retain it lessens. May thou and I, my dear friend, through Divine grace, be protected from this great snare, and though entrusted with only this least of all talents, so use it that through a Saviour's love we may be admitted into His kingdom.' He endeavoured rigidly to act on these principles himself. He did not wait until riches increased before he began to give a portion of his substance to the service of God and man. 'Joseph Sturge,' said Mr. Samuel Bowly to a select circle of friends on the day of his funeral, 'was not always a rich man; he had known what it was to have small means, and to be under the strong necessity of economy in his expenditure. It was then that he began to give, and it was thus that the habit of true Christian liberality was formed.' We are told, indeed, by those who knew him well that in very straitened times, which came upon him more than once during his early struggles in business, he has been known to deny himself dinner that he might have something to give to the cause of charity. But what is perhaps rarer still, his liberality kept pace with the increase of his means. It would be impossible even if it did not savour of an ostentation most alien from his character to enumerate even his large pecuniary contributions to various benevolent objects, not only in this country, but we might almost say in all parts of the world. 'Most certainly,' says one who had the best means of knowing, 'up to the time when his family increased, he devoted more than half his entire income to charitable purposes, afterwards about one-third.'

To the same solemn sense of responsibility it was owing that he did not trust his charities to mere impulse. That he was naturally a man of very sensitive sympathies for all forms of suffering is undoubted. But, as Mr. James observed in his funeral sermon,

‘ His benevolence was the *philanthropy of principle*, as well as of feeling; the dictate of his judgment and conscience, as well as the impulse of his heart. He felt it at once his duty and his privilege to do good: a sense of duty gave sanctity to the privilege, and a feeling of privilege imparted pleasure to the duty. Nor was there anything capricious, whimsical, or eccentric in *his* beneficence. It was not with him, merely, as the matter struck him or interested his imagination. He had no exclusive softer seasons of the soul, at which times only he could be approached with hope of relief. He was not one of those fitful benefactors, of whom it is said you never know what to expect from them, profusion or parsimony; much or nothing; surly words or kind deeds. Nor was his beneficence that unsuspecting, credulous, and blind charity which suffers itself to be deceived by specious falsehood, and which is in fact a bonus upon imposture and an invitation to cheats. His well-known philanthropy exposed him incessantly to appeals from all quarters, till they became almost interruptive and annoying. But he bore all with patience and scrutinised every appeal with care, and was as conscientious in refusing to help a bad case as in assisting a good one. In this he acted with a due regard to the well-being of the community: for an indiscriminate benefactor, whose charity is blind or imbecile, is himself almost a pest to society, by multiplying other pests. And then Mr. Sturge’s *manner* of doing good was as unostentatious as his benevolence was diffuse, yet cautious. It distilled as the dew, softly and silently. There was no *profession* of philanthropy—no Pharisaic sounding of the trumpet—no thirst of applause—no courting of attention. He went about doing good, clothed with humility and with the ornament of a meek and quiet spirit, and would have been as willing to do good

under an incognito, had it been possible or proper, as without a concealment. And yet there was a quiet power in his manner, which gave him influence over the mind of others who fell under the fascination of his gentle earnestness.'

It must be added that his generosity was frank and spontaneous as it was abundant. He was emphatically a cheerful giver. His gifts were not wrung from him by importunity, or a sense of emulation or shame. A letter we received from him a year or two prior to his death now lies before us. It was at a critical moment in the history of the Peace question. The biographer had written to Mr. Sturge expressing his conviction of the importance of certain operations in which the Society was then engaged, but fearing that the funds would not allow of their being continued. Here is the reply:—'With regard to the funds, I will remit my 100*l.* to H. Sterry as thou proposes, and though the whole expense of our operations here [which were then very extensive] are on my responsibility, I will hold thee harmless to the extent of 500*l.*, if we cannot raise it elsewhere, rather than our work should be stopped for want of funds.' Was not this a man to give courage and inspiration to all that were about him? Mr. James has said that he was 'not capricious in his benevolence.' He was not capricious in anything. He possessed what we should call a singularly healthy mind. There was nothing in the slightest degree moody, morbid, or fickle about him. There are men, and very good men too, with whom it is difficult and painful to co-operate, from deficiencies of temper. You have to study their moods, to humour their eccentricities of thought or feeling, to beware how you touch their too vigilant self-esteem, to watch your opportunity before you can get them to act, for, while sometimes ardent and enthusiastic, they

are at other times gloomy and irresolute. But not so with Joseph Sturge. He was blest with a most fresh, free, vigorous nature. You were sure of always finding him the same, always cheerful as the day, always firm of purpose, always generous and ready. Never was there a man more thoroughly reliable. You could count upon him as you could upon the ordinances of nature that are fixed by a divine law.

Another very marked feature in his character was his implicit loyalty to principle. He was less the slave of opinion, that tyrant of modern society, than any man we have ever known. When any cause or question came to seek his suffrage, he did not ask whether it was popular or in good repute, or like to prove successful, but whether it was true and right. There are excellent persons to be found who have just and generous impulses, but who are paralysed by the haunting shadow of their own reputation. Before you can induce them to take part in any movement, you must first be ready to answer satisfactorily such questions as these:—Have any of the rulers or respectabilities of their own circle believed on it? Who is to be, and who is not to be, there? They will give their money, and even their counsel and cooperation, in a private way; but they will not bring their own good name into any hazard. Joseph Sturge, on the other hand, was willing, like his Master, to make himself of no reputation rather than abandon a good cause. It was not to be supposed that he was altogether unconscious of, or insensible to, the high esteem and admiration which he had won by his long life of active beneficence. Nor can we doubt that it cost him pain to forfeit the good opinions of those around him. But when it was a question between right and reputation, we never saw him hesitate. If he was

only satisfied that he was called by his Master to do any work, however unpopular, he was willing 'to go forth unto Him without the camp bearing His reproach.' This of course implied the possession of courage of the highest sort, and in ample measure. We do not scruple to say that Joseph Sturge was one of the bravest men that ever lived. If he was a Peace man, it was from no constitutional timidity of body or mind. He did not want even that physical courage which is held in such esteem by many. During those stormy political times in Birmingham twenty years ago, of which we have spoken, he often went right into the heart of excited crowds, on the very eve of riot, and sometimes by his calm and friendly counsels succeeded in doing what the authority of the law and the terrors of the police failed to accomplish. But we speak of a higher kind of courage than that. He belonged to that class of brave men of whom the poet speaks—

'They are brave who know to speak
For the fallen and the weak;
They are brave who calmly choose
Hatred, scoffing and abuse,
Rather than in silence shrink
From the truth they needs must think;
They are brave who dare to be
In the right with two or three.'

It was a courage resting on conscience, and sustained by a most firm and resolute will. 'When his mind was once made up,' says Mr. James, 'on a point of duty, he was resolved to go forward, though all the world frowned, or laughed in a chorus. If others would go with him, well. If not, he would go alone. In all matters of *duty* he had the courage of a hero and the constancy of a martyr. These are the men that bless the world, the men of determination that can breast the wave of

opposition, and encounter the storms of ignorance or reproach.'

All this imparted extraordinary force to his character, and that force was directed with steady purpose to promote the welfare of the world. His friend Mr. Lewis Tappan, in a letter to him acknowledging the receipt of his portrait, says, 'Just as I received it, I had been looking on the portrait of our General Scott, and on turning to yours, I could not help thinking, what a mercy *you* are not a general, otherwise with your energy who can tell what mischief you would do in the world.' Happily all the force and fervour of his character were employed not to destroy but to save and bless. 'He was equal,' says Mr. Cobden in a letter now before us, 'to any three men I have ever known in the performance of the highest duties of humanity. Doubtless he was naturally gifted with a rare energy which enabled him to accomplish what would have been beyond the strength of other men. But he did not spare himself. He taxed his power to the utmost.'

But with all this decision and energy there were united a humility, a modesty, a gentleness, and a charity towards others who differed from him, which are very rarely found in combination with such qualities. This was the peculiarity that most forcibly struck all who knew him. 'I wish,' says Mr. Whittier, 'it were in my power to write all I feel in respect to dear Joseph Sturge, and especially in connection with his visit to the United States. His narrative is very truthful and explicit in its details of his labours here; but it does not give an idea of the painful and very trying nature of his mission—the groundless suspicions, the coldness and unkindness of many, and the hard indifference and open opposition of others. Very thankful I often feel

that it was my privilege to be near him, to render him some little assistance and sympathy, and to witness from day to day his unselfish regard for others, his firm, unbroken hold upon principle, his patience, forbearance, and generous allowance for difference of opinion, habit, and education, his boundless charity and good-nature—all in connection and in peaceful accordance with a calm steady perseverance in what he believed to be right. I never knew a gentler man, nor a firmer one.'

To the same effect is the testimony of the Rev. Charles Vince in his funeral sermon. 'The "good man" was manifested,' he says, 'in our departed friend's gentleness of spirit and kindness of manner. This took away all that might seem ruggedness in his adherence to duty. In cultivating charity we are always in more or less danger of letting go truth, while the presence of firmness is often fatal to gentleness. It is very difficult to blend the two virtues of adherence to principle with charity and tenderness of heart. In this respect Joseph Sturge was eminently successful. Who that had only seen his sunny countenance and observed how he received the confidence of the little children that gathered around him, could have supposed that in him were united the strength of the Doric pillar and the beauty of the Ionic capital? Yet the truth is that he possessed a Christian courage which braved opposition and danger, combined with a gentleness that took the children even of strangers to his bosom.'

And finally, we cite on this point the words of Lord Brougham, who knew him in the midst of the hottest and most painful parts of the Anti-slavery struggle. At a meeting over which he presided soon after Joseph Sturge's death, his lordship, after referring to several of his old associates in the Anti-slavery cause then

gone, and especially dwelling on the eloquence of Wilberforce, added :—

‘There was the silent eloquence of a good life in the history of Joseph Sturge; a silent eloquence by which he persuaded men to follow his example, and by which he always fortified and strengthened every good cause to which he devoted himself, and I know of none in which he was not a labourer. A sound judgment, a steady adhesion to his principles, and, when they differed from other men’s, a tolerance of which I hardly ever saw the like; a perfect charity and even kindness towards those with whom he differed most—these were his characteristics; and the death of such a man is an irreparable loss.’

But the biographer has no purpose to represent him as a faultless character, though he is free to confess he was the nearest to that of any man whom he has known in life. But how far *he* was from feeling so himself, how constant was the struggle he had to maintain with the imperfections of his nature, how profound was his sense of his own demerits, may be seen by the spirit of deep debasement with which he ever prostrated himself before the face of Infinite Purity. A few months before his death, on February 15, 1859, he wrote to the Rev. Joseph Ketley of Demerara :—

‘I wish I could more fully realise my personal interest in a Saviour’s atoning sacrifice; and had a more lively faith to realise the things that are unseen and eternal.

‘Sometimes I seem to have little more to rest upon than a deep sense of the depravity of my own heart, and my immeasurable distance from the Christian standard, which is the perfect pattern held up to us.

‘It is better to feel and to know this, than to suppose that we have a single rag of our own righteousness to trust to, if it does not cast us down below hope; and this it need not, for we know the mission of Christ was not to save the

righteous, but sinners; and that none are so low as to be beyond the reach of His mercy, who is as boundless in love as He is in power.'

Knowing how strong our friend's own convictions were as to the duty of faithfully portraying the characters of the dead, we dare not withhold the shades from his.

We have been told that in the earlier part of his life the decision of character for which he was so remarkable was sometimes in danger of passing into something like a dogmatic wilfulness, which made him impatient of other men's opinions. Hence he was often called 'impracticable' by less bold and adventurous spirits than himself. But it is hard to say how far he was in fault even in this respect. It is very certain, at any rate, that some of the things in regard to which he was most confidently branded as impracticable he proved were *not* impracticable, simply by doing them. And whatever of this ungracious positiveness may have once existed had in his later years mellowed down into a most child-like tractableness. The writer has a vivid remembrance of one illustration of this when he was with him on a peace mission on the Continent. Mr. Sturge had written a letter to rather a high personage on a question to him of considerable importance, and then read it over to the biographer. The latter ventured rather hesitatingly to express a doubt as to the wisdom of sending it, assigning his reasons for that opinion. He reflected a moment, and then said, 'I believe thou art right; it shall not go.' Indeed, the writer is obliged to say that during the time he had intercourse with him, he never knew a man more amenable to reason, when urged by those whose judgment he respected, and on whose sympathies in his objects he thought he

could rely. This does not of course apply to questions of principle, for on them it was no more use trying to move him than to move the Alps. Still it is very conceivable, even to those who only knew him in his later days, that when in the full robust energy of his manhood there may have been something too much of the peremptoriness implied by the Napoleon brow. It is possible also that one of his noblest characteristics, of which we have already spoken—his obedience to duty irrespective of other men's judgments—may have sometimes been pushed to an extreme. 'I remember,' says one who knew him well and loved him dearly, 'I used to think that his independence of the opinions of others, his want of "the love of approbation," was such as almost to amount to a defect. He was more regardless of the opinion of the world than any man I ever knew. This would have been a dangerous feature of his character, if his standard of rectitude had not been of the highest. As it was, I think he sometimes needlessly exposed himself to misconstruction by this disregard of what would be said or thought of his proceedings.'

But perhaps the besetting infirmity of his nature was a certain impetuosity of temper, which betrayed him occasionally into the use of hasty and passionate expressions. It was hardly possible, indeed, that so much energy and fervour of character could exist apart from a rather ardent temperament. It will be remembered that he speaks of himself, in his school-boy days, as having a 'rather peppery' temper. And bravely as he struggled all through life to conquer it, it seems there were still occasional ebullitions of the old vehemence. At the worst, indeed,

'He carried anger as the flint bears fire,
Which, much enforcéd, shows a hasty spark
And straight is cold again.'

And when he had erred, or imagined he had erred in this respect, his penitence was profound, and the amends he made magnanimous. The Rev. J. H. Wilson, now Secretary of the Home Missionary Society, but who was once associated with Mr. Sturge in some of his labours at Birmingham, tells an anecdote which is beautifully illustrative of this. At one of the stormy political meetings which were often held in the town, in connection with the question of the suffrage, a working-man opposed some proposal of his with a pertinacity and passion which provoked Mr. Sturge to rebuke him, in words which no one else thought particularly harsh or offensive. Still, when the excitement was over, the remembrance of them grieved him deeply. The next morning he sent for Mr. Wilson, and said to him, 'James, thou must find out that working-man to whom I spoke last night, and bring him to me.' 'But I don't know his name, or where he lives,' was the reply. 'It doesn't signify,' answered he, 'he *must* be found; I have not slept all night for thinking of the words I said to him. I can't rest until I have apologised and asked his pardon.' The quest was made, and the man was found and brought to him, and he did apologise with a manly candour and humility that went straight to the poor fellow's heart. From that time he took the man by the hand, and befriended him for years.

It is also a noble testimony to the triumph of Christian principle over natural infirmity that he had so schooled and mastered his temper, that his apparently imperturbable calmness, amid very trying circumstances, was precisely the thing which struck all men as one of

his most characteristic qualities. 'The very gentlest of all human natures,' are the words of his American poet-friend, words which we have no doubt have been echoed by thousands who knew him, as most happily descriptive of what he was. And beyond doubt his *was* one of the gentlest of all human natures. And if it was so rather by divine grace than by original tendency, all the more are we bound to glorify the grace of God in him.

We have candidly told all the evil we knew of him. Happy are those who have no graver flaws in their character than these. His failings, such as they were, sprung from the conflict of qualities all of which were necessary to make him the admirable man he was, though occasionally one class may have pushed into undue ascendancy over the others.

'But now he rests; his greatness and his sweetness
No more shall seem at strife,
And death has moulded into calm completeness
The statue of his life.'

Such he was, and we fear 'we ne'er shall look upon his like again.' We bless heaven for the intimate friendship into which we were admitted with Joseph Sturge as one of the highest privileges of our existence. To know such a man was to think better of the whole human race. We feel still that when wearied with unsuccessful labour in the fields where he so long and bravely toiled, when cast down by disappointment or hope deferred, when in danger of being soured by the selfishness of some and the lukewarmness of others with whom we may be brought into contact, the memory of him we have lost—his strong faith, his Christian gentleness, his high courage, his unselfish dedication to the service of God and man—will come

to us with healing on its wings, soothe our irritation, and by his example, we hope, nerve our hearts to a patient continuance in well-doing irrespective of the world's frowns or smiles.

But perhaps the best delineation of Mr. Sturge's character is given in the following exquisite lines of Whittier entitled

IN REMEMBRANCE OF JOSEPH STURGE.

'In the fair land o'erwatched by Ischia's mountains,
Across the charmed bay
Whose blue waves keep with Capri's silver fountains
Perpetual holiday,
A King lies dead; his wafer duly eaten,
His gold-bought masses given;
And Rome's great altar smokes with gums to sweeten
A name that stinks to heaven.
And while all Naples thrills with mute thanksgiving,
The court of England's Queen
For the dead monster, so abhorred while living,
In mourning garb is seen.
With a true sorrow God rebukes that feigning;
By lone Edgbaston's side
Stands a great city in the sky's sad raining,
Bare headed and wet eyed!
Silent for once the restless hive of labour,
Save the low funeral tread,
Or voice of craftsman whispering to his neighbour
The good deeds of the dead.
For him no minster's chant of the immortals
Rose from the lips of sin,
No mitred priest swung back the heavenly portals
To let the white soul in.
But age and sickness framed their tearful faces
In the low hovel's door,
And prayers went up from all the dark by-places
And Ghettos of the poor.
The pallid toiler and the negro chattel,
The vagrant of the street,
The human dice wherewith in games of battle
The lords of earth compete,

Touched with a grief that needs no outward draping,
All swelled the long lament
Of grateful hearts, instead of marble shaping
His viewless monument!

For never yet with ritual pomp and splendour,
In the long heretofore,
A heart more loyal, warm, and true, and tender,
Has England's turf closed o'er.

And if there fell from out her grand old steeples
No crash of brazen wail
The murmurous woe of kindreds, tongues, and peoples
Swept in on every gale.

It came from Holstein's birchen-belted meadows,
And from the tropic calms
Of Indian islands in the sun-smit shadows
Of occidental palma.

From the locked roadsteads of the Bothnian peasants
And harbours of the Finn,
Where war's worn victims saw his gentle presence
Come sailing, Christ-like, in.

To seek the lost, to build the old waste places,
To link the hostile shores
Of severing seas, and sow with England's daisies
The moss of Finland's moora.

Thanks for the good man's beautiful example,
Who in the vilest saw
Some sacred crypt or altar of a temple
Still vocal with God's law;

And heard with tender ear the spirit sighing
As from its prison cell,
Praying for pity, like the mournful crying
Of Jonah out of hell.

Not his the golden pen's or lip's persuasion,
But a fine sense of right,
And truth's directness, meeting each occasion
Straight as a line of light.

His faith and works, like streams that intermingle,
In the same channel ran;
The crystal clearness of an eye kept single
Shamed all the frauds of man.

The very gentlest of all human natures
He joined to courage strong,
And love outreaching unto all God's creatures
With sturdy hate of wrong.

Tender as a woman ; manliness and meekness
In him were so allied
That they who judged him by his strength or weakness
Saw but a single side.

Men failed, betrayed him ; but his zeal seemed nourished
By failure and by fall ;
Still a larger faith in human kind he cherished,
And in God's love for all.

And now he rests : his greatness and his sweetness
No more shall seem at strife,
And death has moulded into calm completeness
The statue of his life.

Where the dews glisten and the song-birds warble
His dust to dust is laid,
In Nature's keeping, with no pomp of marble
To shame his modest shade.

The forges glow, the hammers all are ringing
Beneath its smoky veil,
Hard by the city of his love is swinging
Its clamorous iron flail.

But round his grave are quietude and beauty,
And the sweet heaven above—
The fitting symbol of a life of duty
Transfigured into love !

APPENDIX.

THE following is the *official* reply of the Emperor of Russia to the Friends' deputation:—

‘ Sa Majesté l’Empereur a reçu l’Adresse présentée par la Députation de la Société des Amis avec une vive satisfaction, comme l’expression de sentiments entièrement conformes à ceux dont Il est animé lui-même. Sa Majesté a horreur comme eux de la guerre, et désire sincèrement le maintien de la paix. Pour y arriver Elle est prête à oublier insultes et offenses personnelles, à tendre le premier la main à Ses ennemis et à faire toutes les concessions compatibles avec l’honneur. Sa Majesté n’attaquera pas: Elle ne fera que se défendre, et sera toujours disposée à entendre des offres de paix.

‘ L’Empereur regrette vivement l’état actuel des choses, et Il en rejette loin de lui la responsabilité. Il a constamment désiré vivre en bonne entente avec l’Angleterre: Il a une sincère affection pour la Reine, qu’Il estime comme Souveraine, Femme, Épouse, et Mère; et Il Lui a donné des preuves non équivoques de confiance et d’égards. Sa Majesté répudie toute idée ambitieuse de conquête ou d’ingérence injuste dans les affaires de la Turquie: Elle n’y réclame que ce qu’Elle a le droit de demander en vertu des traités explicites conclus par Ses devanciers et par elle-même. Le lien qui unit la Russie à ses co-religionnaires en Orient date d’il y a 900 ans; c’est de l’ancien Empire Grec que lui est venu le Christianisme, et depuis ce tems une communauté constante d’intérêts religieux a été maintenue entre la Russie et l’Empire

de Byzance jusqu'à sa chute. Débarrassée elle-même du joug des Tartares, la Russie s'est depuis ce tems constamment appliquée à améliorer le sort de ses co-religionnaires : elle y a travaillé avec succès. Elle ne saurait récuser ses sympathies religieuses pour eux et renoncer à une influence légitime acquise au prix de son sang. Mais l'Empereur ne veut rien au delà : Il n'en veut nullement aux Turcs : et Il serait heureux de voir l'Angleterre rendre meilleure justice au mobile qui a guidé ses actions. Il ne croit pas lui avoir jamais donné le moindre motif de plainte ; et Il en appelle au témoignage de tous les Anglais établis dans ce pays, qui n'hésiteront pas, Sa Majesté en est convaincue, à déclarer qu'ils n'ont eu toujours qu'à se louer de l'accueil qu'ils ont trouvé en Russie.

(Signed) 'NESSELRODE.

' Pétersbourg, le 1^{er} Février 1854.'

PUBLIC TESTIMONIES.

We had intended to have inserted here the addresses and resolutions adopted by various public bodies on the death of Mr. Sturge, and sent to his family, gratefully acknowledging his services and recording their sense of his eminent worth ; but as it would swell the volume to undue dimensions, we must be content with merely enumerating the principal of them :—

The Birmingham Town Council.
 The Birmingham Anti-Slavery Society.
 The Birmingham Baptist Missionary Society.
 The Birmingham Sunday School Union.
 The Committee of the Birmingham Town Mission.
 The Missionaries of the Birmingham Town Mission.
 The Birmingham Band of Hope.
 The Teachers of Severn Street Sunday School.
 The Adult Scholars of Severn Street Sunday School.
 The Band of Hope Union.
 From 1,200 children of the Birmingham Band of Hope.
 The London Peace Society.
 The American Peace Society.
 The Liverpool Peace Society.

The British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society.

The Newcastle and Gateshead Anti-Slavery Society.

The National Temperance League.

The Wolverhampton Temperance Society.

The North Staffordshire Temperance Association.

The Newport Temperance Society.

The Workmen in J. and C. Sturge's employment at Gloucester.

The Working Men's Institute at Gloucester, &c. &c.

From several congregations of negroes in the West Indies, &c. &c.

We must make an exception, however, in favour of the following as a sample of

NEGRO GRATITUDE.

'The accompanying address from free negroes in Jamaica, to the family of the late Joseph Sturge, will probably be read with interest by many.

'At a meeting of the Church and Congregations in Spanish Town and Sligoville, in the parishes of St. Catherine and St. Thomas-in-the-Vale, Jamaica, under the pastoral care of the Rev. J. M. Phillippo, it was unanimously resolved,—

“That this meeting has heard with deep sorrow the death of their devoted friend and benefactor, Joseph Sturge, Esq., and hereby express their heartfelt sympathy with the friends of religion, of justice, and of humanity at large, in that affecting Providence by which they have been called to sustain the loss of so distinguished a Christian and philanthropist.

“They more especially express their condolence with Mrs. Sturge and family, who under such painful circumstances, in relation to the suddenness of the bereavement, mourn the loss of so affectionate and devoted a husband, father, and friend. But while they so deeply deplore his loss, and record their testimony to the great and varied excellences of Mr. Sturge's character in the relationships both of public and private life, as connected more immediately with the interests of his native land, this meeting, consisting chiefly of emancipated peasantry, cannot but feel

themselves laid under the deepest obligations on account of his long, arduous, and unwavering advocacy of their rights as men and as British subjects, particularly for his noble and generous conduct in personally visiting the West Indies in 1837 (well remembered by many of them), in order to acquaint himself with the odious system of apprenticeship to which they were then subject, and by which he was enabled to collect the facts that so effectually moved the people and Parliament of England to effect their complete emancipation.

“This boon, which it need scarcely be said they estimate beyond all price, and for which they trust they are increasingly thankful, they attribute chiefly, under God, to the efforts of their departed friend and his associate, Thomas Harvey, Esq., and they are persuaded that in this testimony they speak the sentiments of the whole emancipated population, not only of Jamaica, but those of the enfranchised peoples of all the British colonies.

“All feel that they are bereaved of a friend and benefactor, whose anxiety and efforts for their welfare have never been surpassed, and will ever associate the name of Sturge in their recollection with Clarkson, Wilberforce, Buxton, and others, gone also to their reward—the noblest and best friends of the African race that history records.

“Mr. Sturge, however, not only occupied the highest rank as an abolitionist; while he endeavoured to free the body of the slave from degrading vassalage, he to the last hour of his life consecrated his influence and property towards raising him, by Christian education, to that rank in the scale of being, of which by his circumstances and condition he had been so unjustly deprived. But for his unfaltering generosity in this department of benevolence, (by no means the least important), and that of others of the Society of Friends in particular, in aiding the various educational establishments in Jamaica, as many of this meeting can testify, few would have emerged from the abject mental condition in which the dark reign of slavery left them.

“In recording their expressions of grief, in common with

the whole of their brethren acquainted with Mr. Sturge's sympathies and efforts for the advancement of both their temporal and spiritual welfare, this meeting would not forget that the event was the result of His all-wise ordination, 'who doeth what pleaseth Him in the armies of heaven and among the inhabitants of the earth.'

"They would, therefore, humbly acquiesce in the dispensation, and adore the divine goodness which supported their devoted friend through so long a period of usefulness, and enabled him to perform such a series of eminent services as distinguished his life, and earnestly pray that his children, and all who were privileged with his acquaintance, together with all who may hereafter know his worth, may imitate him in all that ennobled and distinguished him as a philanthropist, and in everything that was amiable and attractive in his character as a Christian.

"On behalf of the Church and Congregations.

(Signed)

"JAMES M. PHILLIPPO, Pastor.

WILLIAM HALE,

WM. ALBANY NORMAN,

THOMAS GALE,

HENRY MADISSON,

JOSEPH M'CULLOCH."

} Deacons.

OBITUARY NOTICES OF THE PUBLIC PRESS.

We are unwilling to omit some of the eloquent tributes to Mr. Sturge's character which appeared in the public press, especially of Birmingham and its neighbourhood:—

BIRMINGHAM DAILY POST.

'The historic men of the last generation are rapidly disappearing in Birmingham. Last week Thomas Clutton Salt passed away from amongst us; to-day we have to record the death of Joseph Sturge. The sad event took place very unexpectedly on Saturday morning at his residence, Wheeley's Road, Edgbaston. As the intelligence spread throughout the

R R

town during the day, the feeling seemed to be general that in losing Joseph Sturge Birmingham had lost one of its most honoured citizens. Nearly a quarter of a century ago, Mr. Wm. Redfern, in a letter to Thomas Attwood, spoke of Mr. Sturge as being "distinguished by a noble simplicity of character, a pure and untiring philanthropy, and the steadiest and most uncompromising devotion to principle." The rising generation know very little of the course of conduct which gained their townsman so enviable a position before he had passed the meridian of manhood; but they probably are to some extent aware that since then Mr. Sturge's life has been one long constant endeavour to benefit his fellow-men. No one was more addicted to "doing good by stealth;" and as to his "blushing to find it fame," it was sometimes amusing to see how the good man fidgeted about and actually writhed under the infliction of having his benevolence trumpeted forth at a public meeting by some well-meaning admirer. As we believe his charities and schemes of philanthropy were chiefly dictated by his strong sense of personal responsibility, it is not for us, even if we could, to attempt to chronicle them here.

'Mr. Sturge's character may be very briefly summed up. He was a rare specimen of the Christian man of the world. While attending rigidly to business, he so systematised it that he had always time for the service of other people, and was constantly equal to the task of fulfilling, on the instant, each duty of life as it arose. When a deed of mercy was to be done, self was the last consideration that presented itself; and that square head of his, with its stern pent-house eyebrows, and the kindly eye beneath, betokened a man to whom no second appeal on behalf of the down-trodden was necessary. His fine, simple, Puritan-like aspect and bearing always suggested that if he had lived in the days of Cromwell, sword and Bible would have been both well used by him; while his general character might have suggested to Tennyson the lines —

"Howe'er it be, it seems to me
 'Tis only noble to be good; —
 Kind words are more than coronets,
 And simple faith than Norman blood."

THE BIRMINGHAM JOURNAL.

‘ At the present moment, when the imagination of men is vehemently excited by “the pomp and circumstance of glorious war,” and awfully impressed by the expectation of terrible and world-shaking events, it is especially expedient for our thoughts to repose upon a life calm, simple, steadfast, fruitful, and beneficent as was that of the admirable citizen upon whom the grave has just closed. While men are contemplating with troubled and perplexed care the strange career and portentous greatness of that foremost man of all the world, the Emperor of the French, and are eagerly looking forward to the manifestation of rare military genius and supreme destructive capacity in him, or in some French or Italian officer hitherto unknown, we cannot do better than ponder awhile over the character of the eminent English philanthropist, of the devoted champion of peace, who shed upon this town the lustre of his truly Christian life, and his truly national reputation.

‘ Mr. Sturge was one of those characters which it seems given to England alone to produce and appreciate; one of those public men whose might is in their sense of right, whose powerful voice is altogether governed by their scrupulous and tender conscience, who, when they have once taken up a cause, never lay it down, but cleave to it through evil report and good report; who could work for it with a multitude; who could work for it alone; whom public disapproval does not dishearten; whom public applause does not enervate. Conscientious, benevolent, devout, intent upon obeying his conscience, helping his race, and serving his God, he pursued these high ends untiringly, both in retirement and before the world. Altogether untainted by vanity or ambition, he was no less free from morbid modesty and disabling fastidiousness. When good was to be done in secret, no man’s left hand was more unaware of the beneficence of his right hand; when a cause had to be publicly upheld, no one could assume a prominent position with more simplicity, or sustain it with

more dignity and firmness, careless of small cavillers and mean disparagers.

‘Capable alike of directing the good dispositions, or resisting what he held to be the evil inclinations of his countrymen, he had the opportunity, on the two most prominent occasions of his life, of manifesting both these high capacities. As the champion of the slaves he commanded the sympathy of England, as the champion of peace he offended her patriotic susceptibility; as the hastener of negro emancipation he succeeded, as the deprecator of the Russian war he failed. His visit to the West Indies was hailed as a deed of heroism; his journey to St. Petersburg was characterised as a piece of ostentatious meddling; but the unavailing visit was undertaken in the same spirit of love to God and man which had inspired the successful journey; and Mr. Sturge as little repented of the one as of the other.

‘No man ever led a life more harmonious, more of a piece with itself. All his powers were under the absolute command of conscience; his smallest sayings and doings, his very outgoings and incomings, were inspired by the voice of principle, the sense of duty. The journeys were not acts of self-indulgence, but expressions of principle; he travelled not in quest of pleasure, but in fulfilment of duty. He visited the West Indies, he explored Schleswig Holstein, he sought St. Petersburg, not to improve his health, to cheer his spirits, to vary his enjoyments, to refine his taste, or even to widen his intellect, but to serve his race and to glorify his God. With him authorship was not a quest of fame, but a service of duty; he wrote books not to advance his own reputation, but to advance a good cause. It is not a little pleasing to reflect upon the esteem and honour that followed this servant of principle and of duty. No inhabitant of this town had so wide and noble a reputation, so high and national a position. Few living Englishmen were more widely esteemed and more deeply honoured, as no living or departed Englishman was more eminently distinguished by intense conscientiousness, practical benevolence, and vital godliness.’

ARIS'S GAZETTE. (Conservative paper.)

‘Although Mr. Sturge held strongly pronounced opinions generally at variance with those of the majority of his countrymen, it would be difficult to say whether he was more respected by his opponents or his friends. The perfect simplicity of his character, his high honour, his sterling honesty in every relation of public and private life, and his readiness to concede to others the same freedom of action and the same purity of motive that he claimed for himself, all contributed to ensure him the respect and regard of every person who knew him. This sentiment of regard his generous beneficence deepened into attachment. His ear was never deaf nor his hand closed against any tale of distress; but not a tithe of his benefactions is known to the world, for, like all good men, he was much given in his charities to observe the Scriptural precept, “Let not thy left hand know what thy right hand doeth.” To public charities and educational institutions he was a constant and liberal donor, and he was also a warm supporter of those religious objects to which his principles, as a member of the Society of Friends, allowed him to contribute. If our space permitted, we could say much more of one, the half of whose virtues will never become known, but whose kindly nature was widely and warmly appreciated even by those who knew little of him, and whose quick active step, cheerful voice, and genial smile, will long be missed by those amongst whom his busy, useful, self-denying life was passed.’

BIRMINGHAM TIMES.

‘When men of mark pass away from amongst us some special notice is called for. We have to chronicle the death of a man well known to everybody for his active benevolence, and the important position he has occupied in the town of Birmingham. We refer to Mr. Joseph Sturge, a man of broad philanthropy, of generous sentiments, of comprehensive politics, and cosmopolitan sympathies. Early on Saturday morning last, his health having failed him somewhat for a

few months past, he rendered up his spirit to the God who gave it, surrounded by his medical attendants and his affectionate family. A serious fit of coughing seemed to affect the heart, and soon after seven o'clock he expired in his own apartment.

**"The chamber where the good man meets his fate,
Is privileged beyond the common walks
Of virtuous life, quite on the verge of heaven."**

The general feeling in the town is one of deep sorrow for his loss, and of strong sympathy with his family in their heavy bereavement. In all the relations of life Mr. Joseph Sturge was exemplary; an honoured citizen, a faithful friend, an affectionate husband, a kind father, a shrewd, practical, clever, business man, a liberal, broad-souled politician, a generous benefactor to the poor, a powerful advocate of temperance, and a living example of what is understood by a really good and virtuous man. Uncompromising in principle, modest in doing deeds that honoured his humanity, simple in a child-like degree and free from duplicity as a lamb, fearful of having his name or his fame blazoned to the world, and persevering in works of pure and unsectarian benevolence, charity, and philanthropy, he lived a life of kindness and good-will to man, and "his works will follow him." "His works of faith and his labours of love" have cheered many a lone and comfortless heart, have aroused many a depressed and sunken spirit, have evolved many a latent and dormant energy, have "blessed many a sad fire-side," and cast a gleam of heaven's own sunshine on many a dark and desolate spot. He was the type of a true Christian, and finished a life of ceaseless activity in the cause of his Master with peace and serenity. A man of purer faith, possessing a deeper sense of his responsibility to God, a greater lover of freedom, and a firmer friend to the working classes, we do not believe remains amongst us. He was a great man as well as a good man, and his name will long be remembered, not only in Birmingham, but in Christendom, as a powerful advocate for free institutions, as a stern opponent of war and

bloodshed, and as a true friend to liberty and humanity. His life should inculcate a great moral lesson; for the

"Lives of great men all remind us,
We should make our lives sublime,
And departing leave behind us
Footprints on the sands of time."

THE STAFFORDSHIRE SENTINEL.

'On Saturday last died Mr. Joseph Sturge. While professors of religion, that way inclined, may dispute whether the Duke of Leeds died a member of the Church of England or the Church of Rome, none who knew him will doubt that the former died a member of the Church of Christ—which is composed of the truly Evangelical believers of all churches—but the faithless professors of none. Other columns contain the impression of various good men as to Mr. Sturge's character and usefulness. He leaves behind him few equal—we believe none superior to himself—for all which constituted, in spirit, utterance, and action, a true Christian in all the relations of life. As he lived, death could not find him unprepared. It has been our lot to meet him frequently in connection with various of the good objects to which his life was consecrated; and to listen to his words. If he were not gifted with fervid eloquence, or a glib utterance, we have often been struck with the ripeness of his wisdom, the comprehensiveness of his views, the direct way in which he went at once to the heart of a subject, the suavity, the simplicity, and firmness with which he ever held to his principles, and the fewness, plainness, and force of the words which he employed in conveying his thoughts, wishes, and purposes to others. Humble, generous, wise, patient, loving—ever developing, in consonant modes, a life, the springs of which were divine—we knew no one who unconsciously drew more largely on the love, trust, and admiration of his fellows, and for whom it was so little needed for them to make the allowances ordinarily exacted by and usually conceded to the infirmities of our common nature. Every clime and every class are debtors to him; and multitudes of hearts—all between those of the most ignorant,

orphan outcasts, and those of persons the most exalted by wealth, rank, connection, learning, wisdom, and piety included—echo his loss.

‘It was but the other day that he stood amongst us—commending even more by his spirit and bearing, than by his words, great principles of action and objects of pursuit with such effect, that his death will probably quicken the thoughts and activities, stimulate the sluggishness and rebuke the asperities of many who wished, while they listened to him, that they could always live and act under the influence of that hour. He knew how to suffer disappointment without mortification; he knew how to labour and endure without impatience; he knew how to be charitable to the erring without complicity in their criminality; to achieve success without pride; and how to be praised without manifesting vanity.’

THE MANCHESTER EXAMINER AND TIMES.

‘We cannot allow such an event as the death of Mr. Joseph Sturge to pass away from the public mind without paying our tribute of sorrow and admiration to the memory of one of the best and noblest-hearted Englishmen of the present age. The motives which actuated him during a long career of unwearied benevolence were of a kind which few, perhaps, could adequately appreciate. The feelings of most men whose lot is cast among the world’s thickest turmoil are apt to get hard and dissonant, and happy indeed may we count him who is able to keep the cords of sympathy within his bosom untangled and unjarred. Whether by temperament, by education, or by strenuous self-discipline, Mr. Sturge succeeded in this rare task. While he took the keenest interest in the events which were passing around him, while no instance of human suffering could be too obscure or too remote to catch his eager eye, and while, at the call of duty, he never shrank from any degree of publicity which the occasion fairly required, his private life was passed in the tranquil atmosphere of piety, out of which he came, single-minded and lion-hearted as an apostle, to do his allotted

work. He brought into public life the sentiments and habits of a recluse. He nourished his soul on those fair pastures which lie far above the common haunts of men, at the base of the everlasting hills. Those mystic tendencies which, in other men or in another age, would have run to seed in useless meditation, quickened by his love of humankind, and matured by his practical instincts, yielded in his case the richest and most seasonable fruit. Quiet and contemplative as an ascetic, he was also ardent and chivalrous as a crusader. A profound sense of religious obligation made him calm, strong, and fearless. The approval of his conscience raised him immeasurably above the world's ridicule. He cared not one jot for the loudest hurricane of fool's laughter. Sceptics and foplings might deride what they were so utterly incompetent to comprehend; he heeded not their antics. Striving always to be true to God and to himself, he found in a sense of duty, fulfilled according to the utmost limits of his capacity, the only reward he ever courted, and from the secret shrine where the saint presented his life-long homage, the man and the citizen went forth to do service for the world.

‘For the admirers of moral prowess, we need not claim on behalf of Mr. Sturge a high place among the great men of the age which is just closing. The history of that period would be incomplete without his name. There is scarcely any important movement for promoting the welfare of his fellow-countrymen, or of mankind, which has been prosecuted during the last forty years, in which he has not taken a prominent part. He battled for the emancipation of the slaves in the British colonies. When apprenticeship was substituted for slavery, he was the first to expose the insidious nature of that arrangement. At his own cost he undertook a journey to the West Indies for the purpose of investigating the facts of the case, and the disclosures he made on his return were the principal means of putting an end to the scandalous compact by which the slaveholder got twenty millions of money, and yet kept possession of his human chattels. Unlike some philanthropists, his zeal on behalf of distant objects did not blind him to the necessities of his own countrymen.

He had no ambition to take rank as a political agitator, but when the working classes were in danger of being led astray by unwise counsels, he stepped forward at once as the advocate of their political rights, and the denouncer of the folly and wickedness of attempting to win those rights by physical force. On one occasion, when the Birmingham Bull-ring was filled with excited crowds, and the troops were ready to fire upon them, his calm and friendly counsels prevented a collision. When the famine raged in Ireland, no man in the three kingdoms exerted himself more assiduously in rendering relief. It is well known that his strongest sympathies were engaged on behalf of the "peace movement." He belonged to a denomination of Christians who, without descending to perplexing subtleties, are content to denounce all war as opposed to the spirit of the Gospel, and who, instead of waiting for the realisation of their objects till mankind in general shall have attained to a stage of ideal perfection, have the inexplicable audacity to go straight to the point at once. It is easy to reduce the abstract peace doctrine to a seeming absurdity, and to charge this absurdity upon those who hold it. Practically they differ from their critics only in adhering more tenaciously to the simple precepts of the Gospel, to the pure dictates of humanity, and by pursuing this course they have rendered incalculable service to the best interests of the world. People don't always know their benefactors. There were many wise men in the days of George Fox, but the intuitions of the devout dreamer have done quite as much as the statecraft of his contemporaries to leaven permanently the mind and heart of England. Mr. Sturge was one of the noblest of the race of heroes who have descended from the loins of their founder. His philanthropy was a sentiment, the offshoot of a beneficent creed, which lived in action. When the war was raging in Denmark, he went straight to the field of battle on the errand of the peacemaker; and when a bloodier conflict was on the eve of commencing, while statesmen were busy with their notes and protocols, he, along with others, repaired to St. Petersburg, had an interview with the Emperor Nicholas, and

strove to win the autocrat to pacific counsels. They failed—how and to what extent it were very bootless now to enquire—and were of course laughed at by those who measure greatness by success, and whose notions of international negotiation are inseparable from diplomatic lace and livery.

‘Thus living, thus humbly and zealously working for the welfare of mankind, the good man has reached the goal, and now rests from his labours. The fiery chariot has caught him up at last, and we know not upon whom his mantle has descended. Happy in his death as he had been useful in his life, he was spared the dreary and painful interval which is usually interposed between the hour of midday toil and the eventide of rest. The summons was sudden and peremptory—one hour in apparent health, the next hour all the care and reckoning of this life finished. People’s thoughts are now employed in contemplating events of a far more exciting character. We can but just hope that one word of sorrowful parting will be heard above the martial din which fills all ears, and the pomp and circumstance of glorious war which occupies all eyes. Two emperors are hastening to measure their swords in mortal strife—two great men, very great according to all vernacular computations, are about to vindicate their reverence for human nature and their love of human freedom by dooming thousands of unoffending men to slaughter. Heaven attend them with what inscrutable benisons it shall deem best on their bloody way, but better is an ounce of goodness than a universe of glory.’

THE MORNING STAR.

‘It is not well that so much excellence should be allowed to pass away from the earth without some attempt being made to fix the eyes of men upon it for a moment in reverence and love, dazzled as we are apt to be by far other kinds of heroisms and celebrities. It is no exaggeration to say that the loss of such a man is a national loss; for he was one of the truest of patriots, one of the most generous of philanthropists, one of the finest instances that our age has

witnessed of a consistent practical Christian. His life was one of continued well-doing. As the foe of slavery, as the friend of peace, as the promoter of temperance and education, as the ready and munificent abettor of innumerable schemes of benevolence both local and general, his name must ever stand on honourable record. He possessed the rarest combination we ever met of gentleness and firmness, presenting in his own person a living refutation of the theory of those who seem to imagine there can be no strength of character without violence and harshness. A kinder and more genial nature, a spirit more tenderly alive to all the finest impulses of humanity, never breathed. His life, indeed—

“Was one full stream of love from font to sea.”

His pecuniary benefactions, though princely both in amount and variety, formed the least part of his charity. What most marked his career was his incessant personal exertions for the benefit of others. He was never happy but when engaged in some pursuit having for its object the welfare of the race; and by the natural ardour of his character, and his extraordinary capacity for labour, he was really able to compress the activities of several lives into one. But united with this benevolent temper was an energy of will, a courageous resoluteness of purpose that no difficulty could daunt, no amount of labour or sacrifice could turn aside. Let his conscience only be once persuaded that a thing was right to be done or attempted, and he was not to be deterred from the effort, however little in accordance with the world's conventionalisms, even though obstacles innumerable stood in the way, and “though,” as John Forster has it, “a whole neighbourhood of fools were to laugh in chorus.”

THE NEW YORK EVENING POST.

‘In the removal of this eminent philanthropist to a better world, his native land has been deprived of one of its best men, and it may be said without exaggeration that the world is a loser by this sad event. Though his affections were strongly centred in a happy home and congenial circle, yet

they embraced the kingdom and extended to all men. He might have said, Wherever there is human want to relieve, there is my country.

‘Though so largely engaged in business transactions, he devoted much of his time and large portions of his wealth to objects of private and general benevolence. He did this unostentatiously but perseveringly, and his benevolent efforts took a wide range. His sympathies were especially with the poor, the enslaved, and all who needed a helper. Among numberless other forms of benevolence, on many occasions has he helped poor youths and adults, in whose future good conduct he had confidence, to emigrate to this country, where they could commence anew without suspicion or hindrance, confiding them to the oversight of some one who was fully and confidentially apprised of their past career. Meritorious persons of various kinds have experienced aid from Mr. Sturge in coming to this country with a view to better their condition; indeed his liberality, kindness and solicitude, in these regards, were extraordinary.

‘Mr. Sturge was a great man because he was a good man. He had rare personal advantages, and a happy combination of excellences. Nature and grace had combined to give the world in him assurance of a man. In the language of the poet Whittier, with reference to him:—

“Unlearned, unknown to lettered fame,
Yet on the lips of England’s poor—
And toiling millions, dwelt his name,
With blessings evermore.
Unknown to power or place, yet where
The sun looks o’er the Carib sea,
It blended with the freeman’s prayer
And song of jubilee.”

‘Joseph Sturge was a man of a remarkably healthy appearance; about the middle height, and stout. His temperament was cheerful; his countenance, especially his sweet smile, indicative of a heart full of benevolence; his sonorous voice and winning manners charmed all who approached him; he had constitutional diffidence mingled with self-respect; he had deference for good men, but was not in

the least awed in the presence of the titled or powerful; he condescended to men of low estate, despised caste and all the aristocratic assumptions of men, never sinking his manhood before wealth or position or arrogating to himself superiority before the lowly and despised; he had a strong sense of justice, integrity, honour; his reverence of the Supreme Being was profound; he respected manhood in all conditions of society; and, to sum up all, he was, to use the language of the Apostle Paul, "A lover of hospitality, a lover of good men, sober, just, holy, temperate."

LONDON

PRINTED BY SPOTTISWOODE AND CO

NEW-STREET SQUARE

RECENTLY PUBLISHED BY
S. W. PARTRIDGE, 9 PATERNOSTER ROW.

- Our Dumb Companions; or, Conversations between a Father and his Children.** By Rev. T. Jackson, M.A. [Shortly.
- How to stop Drunkenness.** By Charles Buxton, Esq., M.P. Crown 8vo. cloth, 1s.
- Spiritual Unfoldings from the Word of Life.** By Rev. F. Whitfield, A.B., Incumbent of Kirkby Ravensworth, Yorkshire. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. cloth, 3s. 6d.
- Voices from the Valley, testifying of Jesus.** Dedicated to the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Ripon. By the same Author. Third Edition. Crown 8vo. cloth, 3s. 6d.
- Window Gardens for the People, and Clean and Tidy Rooms.** By Rev. S. Hadden Parkes, M.A., Curate of St. George's, Bloomsbury. Dedicated by permission to the Earl of Shaftesbury. Crown 8vo. Illustrated. Cloth, 1s.
- The Brewer's Family; or, the Experiences of Charles Crawford.** By Mrs. Ellis, Author of 'The Women of England,' 'Widow Green,' &c. Illustrated. Crown 8vo. cloth, 2s. 6d.
- What Put my Pipe Out; or, Incidents in the Life of a Clergyman.** Illustrated by George Cruikshank. Crown 8vo. cloth, 1s. 6d.
- Homeward Bound: a Seaman's Sunday Book.** By a Sailor's Friend. Limp cloth, 1s.
- Winnowed Grain; or, Selections from the Addresses of the Rev. J. Denham Smith.** Second Edition. Post 8vo. cloth, red edges, 3s. 6d.
- Domestic Addresses, and Scraps of Experience.** By George Mogridge ('Old Humphrey'). Illustrated. 1s. 6d.
- The Coming Glory: a Series of Brief Treatises on the Coming and Kingdom of Christ, as revealed in the Sure Word of Prophecy.** Cloth, 6d.; gilt, 1s.
- Hints on Self Help: a Book for Young Women.** By Jessie Boucherett. Second Thousand. Limp cloth, 1s.
- Good Servants, Good Wives, and Happy Homes.** By Rev. T. H. Walker. Tenth Thousand. Illustrated. Crown 8vo. cloth, 1s. 6d.
- Sortain, of Brighton: a Review of his Life and Ministry.** By Rev. H. S. Hollis. With Engravings. Royal 8vo. cloth, 6s.
- Happy Years at Hand: Outlines of the Coming Theocracy.** By Rev. Dr. Leask. Second Thousand. Crown 8vo. cloth, 4s.
- The Beauties of the Bible. In Ten Lectures.** By the same Author. Third Edition. Post 8vo. cloth, 3s. 6d.
- Willy Heath and the House Rent.** By the same Author. Crown 8vo. cloth, illustrated, 1s. 6d.
- Blind Amos, and his Velvet Principles; or, Proverbs and Parables for the Young Folk.** By Rev. Paxton Hood. New Edition. Crown 8vo. cloth, with Illustrations, 1s. 6d.
- Lectures to the Working Classes.** By Rev. G. Calthrop, Incumbent of Trinity Church, Cheltenham. Cloth gilt, 2s. 6d.
- Have we any Word of God? By the Author of 'Is the Bible True?' Illustrations.** Cloth, 1s.
- Heart Melodies, and Life Lights.** By A. M. H., Authoress of 'The Life Book,' &c. Square 18mo. cloth, 1s.

- The Mother's Picture Alphabet.** Dedicated, by Her Majesty's permission, to H.R.H. the Princess Beatrice. Imperial 4to. plate paper, with Twenty-seven Original Designs by Anelay. Second Edition. Illustrated Wrapper, 3s.; cloth, 7s. 6d.; extra gilt, 10s. 6d.
- The Children's Party; or, a Day at Upland.** Illustrations. Cloth, 1s.
- Our English Months.** By S. W. Partridge. Crown 8vo. cloth, 6s.; gilt, 7s. 6d.; morocco, 10s. 6d.
- Upward and Onward: a Thought Book for the Threshold of Active Life.** By the same Author. Fourth Thousand. Crown 8vo. cloth, 4s.; gilt, 5s.; morocco, 8s.
- One Hundred Popular Hymns, for Infant, Ragged, and Sunday Schools, and Out-door Religious Services.** Selected by R. Mimpriss. On Sheets, size 38 by 27 inches. On roller, 10s.
- The Future: an Outline of Events predicted in the Scriptures.** Being a Revised Edition of 'Themes for Thought in the Prophetic Page.' By the Rev. J. Cox, Author of 'Our Great High Priest,' &c. Cloth, 1s.
- Freemasons'-Hall Addresses.** By the Rev. J. Denham Smith. Paper, 6d.; cloth, 1s.
- The Giants, and How to Fight Them.** By Dr. Newton. Eight Illustrations. Cloth, 1s.
- My Sermon Remembrancer.** (A blank book of upwards of 100 pages, for recording the Heads of Sermons, &c.) Royal 8vo. limp cloth, 1s.
- The Eldest Son.** By Rev. Cæsar Malan, D.D. Limp, 6d.; gilt, 1s.
- Ephraim Holding's Sunday-School Illustrations.** By George Mogridge ('Old Humphrey'). Illustrated. Crown 8vo. cloth, 1s. 6d.
- The Family Instructor.** Thirty-one Leaves of Selected Texts in large type for Families, Schools, &c. Uniform with 'The Silent Comforter.' 1s. 6d.
- Homely Hints on Household Management.** By Mrs. C. L. Balfour. Tenth Thousand. Many Engravings. Cloth, 1s.
- A Mother's Lessons on the Lord's Prayer.** By the same Author. Imperial 4to. with eight full-page Illustrations by Anelay. Paper boards, 2s. 6d.; cloth, 3s. 6d.; gilt, 5s.
- The Wanderings of a Bible.** By the same Author. With Illustrations by J. Gilbert. Cloth, 1s.
- The Governess; or, the Missing Pencil-case.** By the Rev. J. T. Barr. Second Edition. Tenth Thousand. Twelve Engravings. Cloth, 1s.
- The Sick-room and its Secret.** By Mrs. Thomas Geldart. Fifth Thousand. Twenty-two Engravings. Cloth, 1s.
- Our Moral Wastes, and How to Reclaim Them.** By Rev. J. H. Wilson. Second Edition. Illustrated. Cloth, 1s.
- The Prince Consort, his Life and Character.** By the same Author. Sixteenth Thousand. Four Engravings. Cloth, 1s.
- Charles Wesley, the Poet of Methodism.** With List of his Poetical Works, and Autographs of Two Original Hymns. Cloth, 1s.
- Eight Lectures on Prophecy.** From Short-hand Notes, with Corrections and Additions by the Authors. Fifth Edition, revised. 12mo. paper, 1s.; cloth, 1s. 6d.
- Illustrated Songs and Hymns for the Little Ones.** 100 Woodcuts, from Drawings by Sir E. Landseer, Gilbert, Birket Foster, Anelay, Harrison Weir, and Huard. One volume, cloth, 5s.; gilt, 7s. 6d.
- Prayer in the Cottage: the Litany, Prayers, and Collects of the Book of Common Prayer, arranged for thirty-one days' use; together with Select Portions from the Visitation of the Sick.** Uniform with the 'Silent Comforter.' 2s.

NEW WORKS & NEW EDITIONS

PUBLISHED BY

ALFRED W. BENNETT,

5 BISHOPSGATE STREET WITHOUT, E.C.

Third Edition, with Portrait, 2 vols. demy 8vo. 14s.

MEMOIRS of the LIFE and GOSPEL LABOURS of STEPHEN GRELLET. Edited by BENJAMIN SEBBOHM.

'We consider the book one of very great interest and value, and as such, it is our duty and privilege, by the most hearty recommendations, to contribute to its wider circulation.'
Evangelical Magazine.

'Stephen Grellet was a remarkable man, and for many reasons his memory deserves to be held in revered and grateful remembrance.'—*Dial.*

In the press, fcp. 8vo. 2s. 6d. with Portrait.

MEMOIR of THOMAS PUMPHREY, late Superin- tendent of Ackworth School. Edited by JOHN FORD.

Royal 16mo. price 3s. 6d.

THE CHILDREN'S HISTORY of the SOCIETY of FRIENDS. Chiefly compiled from Sewall's History; and written with a view of interesting young children in the early History of the Society.

Post 8vo. cloth, price 6s. 6d.

A MEMOIR of WILLIAM ALLEN, F.R.S. By the Rev. J. SHERMAN, of Surrey Chapel.

'A character at once so devout and humble, so just and generous—in a word, so truly great, seldom, indeed, does it fall to the lot of the biographer to delineate. * * * The book is one of those productions which it seems impossible to read without becoming wiser and better.'
Bath and Cheltenham Gazette.

12mo. cloth, price 3s. 6d.

THE WORKS of ELIHU BURRITT; containing 'Sparks from the Anvil,' 'Voice from the Forge,' and 'Peace Papers for the People.'

'In every line coined from the reflecting mind of the Blacksmith of Massachusetts there is a high philosophy and philanthropy genuine and pure. His sympathies are universal, his aspirations are for the happiness of all, and his writings are nervous, terse, and vigorous.'—*London Telegraph.*

12mo. cloth, price 1s.

SPARKS from the ANVIL. By ELIHU BURRITT. The Thirteenth Thousand.

'These are sparks indeed of singular brilliancy.'—*British Friend.*

'Reader, if you have not read the 'Sparks from the Anvil,' do so at once.'—*The Echo.*

New Edition, 12mo. cloth, price 1s.

A VOICE from the FORGE. By ELIHU BURRITT. Being a Sequel to 'Sparks from the Anvil.'

'We say to all, read it, imbibe its spirit, and learn, like the writer, to work for and with God, towards the regeneration of the world.'—*Nottingham Review.*

12mo. cloth, and in packets, price 1s. each.

PEACE PAPERS for the PEOPLE. By ELIHU BURRITT.

'If we wanted to put into the hands of young people a book likely to draw forth all that is generous in their hearts and solemn in their convictions, in favour of the cause of Peace, this would be the book.'—*Nonconformist.*

Just published, crown 8vo. cloth, 2s. 6d.

THE ANTI-SLAVERY CAUSE in AMERICA, and its MARTYRS. By ELIZA WIGHAM.

New Works and New Editions published by A. W. Bennett.

Just published, fcp. 8vo. price 1s.

HORRORS of the VIRGINIAN SLAVE-TRADE, and the SLAVE-REARING PLANTATIONS. The True Story of Dinah, an escaped Virginia Slave, now in London: on whose body are eleven scars, left by tortures which were inflicted by her Master, her own Father. Together with Extracts from the Laws of Virginia, showing that against these barbarities the law gives not the smallest protection to the slave, but the reverse. By JOHN HAWKINS SIMPSON.

11th Thousand, fcp. 8vo. cloth, price 2s. 6d.

THE PASTOR'S WIFE: a Memoir of Mrs. Sherman, of Surrey Chapel. By Rev. JAS. SHERMAN. With a Portrait.

Second Edition, fcp. 8vo. cloth, price 3s. 6d.

WORKING WOMEN of the LAST HALF-CENTURY
—The Lesson of their Lives. By CLARA LUCAS BALFOUR.

Fcp. 8vo. cloth, price 2s. 6d.; gilt edges, 4s. 6d.

MORNING DEW-DROPS; or, the Juvenile Ab-stainer. By Mrs. CLARA LUCAS BALFOUR. With an Introduction by Mrs. H. B. Brown, and Illustrated by ANELAY.

Fcp. 8vo. cloth, 2s.; sewed, 1s. 6d.

ROGER MILLER; or, Heroism in Humble Life.

A Narrative. By GEORGE ORME. Sixth Thousand.

This work has already had an extended circulation in all the States of the American Union, in Holland (where it has been translated into Dutch), and in many other parts of the continent of Europe.

'A more worthy, diligent, kind, and useful person cannot be found in the whole circle of those who are engaged in the service of the poorer classes.'—*Earl of Shaftesbury.*

Post 8vo. cloth, price 10s. 6d.

THE THREE ARCHBISHOPS. Lanfranc — Anselm —

A'Becket. By WASHINGTON and MARK WILKS.

'A work which most assuredly takes its place among the most valuable of modern contributions to historical literature. With the fidelity of a chronicle it mingles the fascination of a romance. As a truthful record of the conflicts between Church and State in England, from the Conquest till the latter part of the twelfth century, it will serve as an admirable manual for the student: while the sketches of life in olden days, which sparkle in its pages, cannot fail to render it acceptable to the general reader.'—*Morning Star.*

Cloth, price 8s. 6d.

WILLIAM WORDSWORTH: a Biography. By the
Rev. EDWIN PAXTON HOOD.

'The great extent of Mr. Hood's reading—his thorough intimacy with all the highest forms of our literature—has enabled him to bring to the illustration of Wordsworth's mental character, and to the exposition of his style and principles of poetry, an affluence of knowledge rarely to be met with. His page literally blazes with poetry, rich and eloquent dissertation, imagery and allusion varied and beautiful.'—*Evangelical Magazine.*

Crown 8vo. price 1s.

NOTES from the LIFE of a SYRIAN. By ANTONIUS
AMEUNEY, of SYRIA. Being Extracts from the MS. Biography now preparing
for publication.

The early life of the Author was spent in a series of thrilling adventures and daring exploits, performed amid scenery and people the most interesting to every Christian. His journey down the Jordan, and the scientific survey of the Dead Sea, were accomplished only by incurring great peril and imminent personal dangers. His wanderings on Mount Lebanon and among the Arab tribes of the Syrian plains, abound with incidents of a highly romantic and deeply interesting character.

Ninth Edition, toned paper, 18mo. cloth, gilt edges, price 2s. 6d.; paper wrapper, 1s.

HYMNS and MEDITATIONS. By A. L. WARING.

'These Hymns and Meditations appear to us to be the effusions of a mind deeply imbued with the spirit of Christianity, and highly appreciating its blessings. The writer is evidently one who deeply communes with her own heart, and who cannot be satisfied unless she realises the joys of communion with her Saviour. There is, too, a beautiful simplicity in the composition of the Hymns, which renders the perusal of them as pleasing as it is profitable.'

British Mother's Magazine.

London: A. W. BENNETT, 5 Bishopsgate Street Without.

10-7

3 2044 017 950 445

THE BORROWER WILL BE CHARGED
AN OVERDUE FEE IF THIS BOOK IS NOT
RETURNED TO THE LIBRARY ON OR
BEFORE THE LAST DATE STAMPED
BELOW. NON-RECEIPT OF OVERDUE
NOTICES DOES NOT EXEMPT THE
BORROWER FROM OVERDUE FEES.

WIDENER
BOOK DUE
MAY 17 1983

7773026

WIDENER

NOV 7 2003

CANCELLED

NOV 14 1982

